

THE
NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION
OF
EDUCATIONAL
BROADCASTERS

54

A HISTORY

BY
HAROLD E. HILL

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL
BROADCASTERS: A HISTORY

by
Harold E. Hill

Copyright by
The National Association of Educational Broadcasters

14 Gregory Hall
Urbana, Illinois
October, 1954

FOREWORD

This history of the NAEB was written in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Journalism at the University of Illinois, by Harold E. Hill, Associate Director of the NAEB.

This brief history would not have been possible without the cooperation of Harry J. Skornia, Executive Director of the NAEB, and Frank E. Schooley, Director of Broadcasting, University of Illinois and Treasurer of the NAEB.

Dr. Skornia permitted the author to examine all archival material on file at NAEB Headquarters, and his understanding and guidance are greatly appreciated.

Mr. Schooley, long active in the affairs of the NAEB and Executive Secretary 1937-43, made available all of the existing material from the files of the early officers of the Association, and his own personal files of correspondence, records and Newsletters.

The author is also indebted to Mr. Josef Wright, Director of Public Relations, University of Illinois, and Mr. Carl Menzer, Director of WSUI and WSUI-FM, State University of Iowa, both long active in the Association, for their kind assistance in attempts to determine more accurately some of the early events in the history of the NAEB.

Finally, the author wishes to express his gratitude and appreciation to Dr. Fredrick S. Siebert, Director of the School of Journalism and Communications, University of Illinois, under whose supervision this thesis was prepared. His sympathetic understanding, constructive suggestions and continuing guidance made this project possible.

Harold E. Hill
Urbana, Illinois
October 1, 1954

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I Introduction	1
II The Start of Educational Broadcasting	2
III The Association of College and University Broad- casting Stations	4
IV The Struggle for Existence	8
V The National Association of Educational Broadcasters	20
VI The Intermediate Years	24
VII The Post-War Years	36
VIII Dawn of a New Era	41
Bibliography	46
Appendix A	47
Appendix B	52
Appendix C	54

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

This is a history of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters from its inception as the Association of College and University Broadcasting Stations in 1925 to January 1, 1954.

So far as can be determined, no history of the NAEB, as it will hereinafter be referred to, has ever been written before. And yet the NAEB has, since its earliest days, been a force for education through the medium of broadcasting. The role that it has played has been of utmost importance to education as a whole, and to adult education in particular, and today the NAEB is recognized as a leader not only in the field of education but in the entire field of radio and television communication. Such was not always the case, as will be brought out time and time again in recounting the struggle for growth, and even for existence, that educational broadcasters have waged over the years.

In writing a history such as this, the research techniques are different from those involved in the preparation of the usual research paper. The author found very little of value in published works and relied largely on correspondence and other records. For this paper the author read hundreds of letters, official records, official publications, notes, etc., gleaned from the files of the NAEB Headquarters and from the personal files of several past officers. He also talked with, and exchanged correspondence with, present station operators who were among the early members.

Because of the rather tenuous existence of the NAEB in its earliest days, very few complete records were kept, and it is only due to the fact that some of the early officers of the organization were conscientious in maintaining correspondence files that we have any definite record of the first several years of the NAEB.

This paper is presented as a chronological account of the growth and activities of the NAEB, with emphasis on what are probably the three most important aspects of the history of the organization:

- 1) The actual development and expansion of the organization itself,
- 2) The struggle for survival with the commercial broadcasters and the government,
- 3) The continuing efforts to establish some sort of educational network and a permanent headquarters for the organization.

Attached as appendices are tables of supplementary information, such as a list of organization officers for each year and a table showing what has happened to some of the pioneering educational stations. These are not complete in all details because the information could not be obtained because of the incompleteness of early records. However, these appendices have been included as a valuable addition to the historical information about the NAEB.

Chapter II

THE START OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING

The first radio station licensed by the government to an educational institution received its license in 1921. In the next four years, 175 broadcast licenses were issued to such institutions. It looked as though educators had quickly realized the potential of this new medium and were anxious to take advantage of its opportunities. However, more than a quarter of a century was to pass before educational broadcasting achieved the prominence which those early pioneers envisioned.

Most of the early licenses granted to educational stations were assigned to the electrical engineering departments of the institutions concerned for the purpose of experimentation in the field of electronic communication. Not very many of these early licensees were concerned with, or even aware of, the educational potential of this new medium of radio.

Therefore, in many instances, after the early flurry of experimentation had passed, the licenses were permitted to expire, so that by 1926 nearly half of these early stations no longer existed and only 90 educational stations were in operation by the first of that year.

This lack of foresight on the part of many educational institutions, coupled with financial and regulatory problems which developed later, was almost a death blow to educational broadcasting. During the fifteen year period, 1921-1936, a total of 202 broadcast licenses were issued to educational institutions. Of this number 164 were either permitted to expire, transferred to other interests, or revoked by the licensing authority so that on January 1, 1937 only 38 licenses were held by educational institutions, and some of these stations were operated on a commercial rather than an educational basis.¹ Of those licenses which were given up 50 (30.5%) were held for less than one year, 85 (51.8%) for less than two years, 109 (66.5%) for less than three years, and 55 (33.5%) for more than three years. Apparently most of the stations which were able to survive for as long as three years had a good chance of staying on the air indefinitely.

It must be remembered that the entire broadcasting industry was suffering growing pains during this same period, and many commercial stations were also finding it difficult to remain in operation. There was no suitable government regulation, and there was a great deal of confusion and uncertainty in the industry. However, in those early years both the government and the commercial broadcasters apparently were in favor of educational broadcasting, and the then Secretary of Commerce and Labor, Herbert Hoover, made repeated statements about the need for educational stations and his great hopes for the future of educational broadcasting.

At this time, because of the lack of, and need for, suitable legislation in the field of broadcasting, Secretary Hoover called annual National Radio Conferences in Washington so that broadcasters might get together with the proper governmental authorities in an effort to iron out the many problems facing the industry. These

conferences also made specific recommendations to the government as to what form legislation should take. At each of the conferences a great deal was said about the need for regulation to maintain broadcasting in the public interest. Resolutions were adopted calling for less advertising and for ample protection for educational stations.

It was at the 1925 Conference that educational broadcasters finally banded together as the Association of College and University Broadcasting Stations.

Chapter III

THE ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY BROADCASTING STATIONS

On November 12, 1925, broadcasters attending the Fourth National Radio Conference in Washington, D. C., adopted a resolution calling for full recognition by the Department of Commerce (at that time the licensing authority) of the needs of educational broadcast stations and recommending that "adequate, definite and specific provision should be made for these services within the broadcast band of frequencies."²

In view of this expression of interest on the part of all broadcasters, and a growing awareness on the part of educational broadcasters of the need for united action, a group of educational broadcasters in attendance at the conference formed the Association of College and University Broadcasting Stations. "Temporary officers were appointed and these were later elected by letter ballot to serve for the year 1926."³

The purpose of the organization was stated in the Preamble to the Constitution which was adopted:

"Believing that radio is in its very nature one of the most important factors in our national and international welfare, we, the representatives of institutions of higher learning, engaged in educational broadcasting, do associate ourselves together to promote, by mutual cooperation and united effort, the dissemination of knowledge to the end that both the technical and educational features of broadcasting may be extended to all."⁴

Active membership was open to all educational institutions owning and operating their own broadcasting stations. Associate membership was open to individuals interested in the general furtherance of educational broadcasting. Dues were \$3.00 per year.

Efforts were immediately made by the officers of the new organization to get as many educational stations as possible into the organization. However, since the Association had no definite goals and offered little in the way of service to its members, less than 50% of the educational stations on the air were included in the membership in any of the early years. In brief, the ACUBS was a loosely-knit organization, with a few men of foresight and vision struggling valiantly, and often vainly, to unite educational broadcasters across the country into a compact organization with definite goals.

In 1926, there were 41 dues paying members of the Association. It is interesting to note that of this number only 10 are still active members of the NAEB. A table showing what has happened to those original 41 member stations over the years is found in Appendix B.

With a rather small membership and only \$3.00 annual dues, the ACUBS did not have enough money to launch any cooperative projects that might have made the organization much stronger to say nothing of advancing the general cause of educational broadcasting. For example, as of December 18, 1926, the ACUBS had a bank balance of only \$74.50, and even this was unavailable because the bank in which it was deposited had closed. Incidentally, this bank paid a 40% dividend in 1927, so that \$29.80 of the original balance was recovered.

The history of these early years is very sketchy and can only be partially reconstructed from correspondence between early officers. Even this is rather limited and so far as actual organizational records are concerned, they are practically nonexistent. The earliest official document that can be found is a time record, dated June 1, 1926, showing that a Chris Kein was paid \$8.14 (23 hours @ \$.35) for stenographic work.

During 1927 the financial stability of the organization was threatened to such an extent that an additional \$3.00 assessment had to be levied. There were 37 members that year and 29 of them paid this additional assessment. If the Association had not received the 40% dividend mentioned above they would not have been able to meet all their obligations. As it was they ended the year, 1927, with a balance of \$15.37.

During the period (1926-1930) the correspondence among the various officers reflects their general concern over matters of membership, finances, organizational projects, etc. Unfortunately, they were so occupied with the problems of keeping their own stations on the air and trying to arouse the interest of other educational stations in the value of belonging to ACUBS that they did not have the time to develop projects that would have enabled the organization to grow and prosper on its merits. However, this small handful of men never gave up, and, although they encountered seemingly insurmountable obstacles, they held the organization together by their own devotion to purpose through these years of tribulation. The names of most of these men are to be found in the list of officers through the years given in Appendix C, but there were undoubtedly others, whose names do not appear on the surviving records who also played an important role.

By 1928, the membership had fallen to 23 active members, and the bank balance to \$6.52, and by 1929, although the bank balance had risen to \$88.72, there were only 22 active and 2 associate members. This decrease in membership was not necessarily due to a decline in interest in the Association. There had been a steady decrease in the number of educational stations on the air and this decrease was reflected in the membership of the ACUBS. However, some of the earlier members were losing interest because they felt that there was no value in continuing to pay dues, however small, to an organization that wasn't doing anything in a material way for the educational broadcaster.

Although the membership remained small, the officers and others interested in the welfare of the Association were becoming more and more convinced of the value of educational broadcasting, and they began to talk about more definite goals for the organization and ways in which better service could be rendered to the member stations.

The first annual convention of the ACUBS was held in Columbus, Ohio, July 1 and 2, 1930, in conjunction with the Institute for Education by Radio (IER), sponsored by the Ohio State University. It was general practice for a number of the educational broadcasters to attend the Institute each year, and it was decided that it would be worthwhile to have a meeting of the ACUBS at the same time.

The need for a more closely-knit organization was becoming more and more apparent at this time. The depression had forced many institutions to close their radio stations, and those remaining on the air were often hard-pressed for sufficient money to carry out their operations. The Federal Radio Commission (FRC) was just beginning to cause educational broadcasters trouble in the matter of frequency assignments and time allotments. And commercial operators had lost their earlier concern for education, as expressed at the Fourth Radio Conference mentioned earlier, and were doing everything within their power to have the time and frequencies used by educational stations assigned to commercial stations. This was not too surprising in view of the increased growth of broadcasting and the resulting competition for facilities.

In spite of these problems facing educational broadcasters and the fervor of the "devoted few," the ACUBS could still number less than 50% of the country's educational stations among its membership. There were only 25 active members of the Association in 1930, and several important stations (now very active in the affairs of the NAEB) had not yet been convinced of the value of membership -- stations such as KSAC (Kansas State College), WBAA (Purdue University), WKAR (Michigan State College,) and WLB (University of Minnesota, now KUOM).

Because of the attempt by commercial broadcasters to obtain the facilities then in use by educational stations, the ACUBS, in that first meeting in Columbus in 1930, decided that definite steps would have to be taken to increase their organizational strength and to recruit the help of others if their fight was to be successful.

Consequently, the Association sent the following telegram to the state Governors who were then holding their annual conference in Salt Lake City:

"The members of the Association of College and University Broadcasting Stations, in annual meeting here, respectfully call your attention to the fact that the Federal Government will have to assume through Congressional enactment some degree of responsibility if educational broadcasting is to remain under the control of schools, colleges, universities or state or national educational officials. Such responsibility should, in our opinion, include the reservation of channels for broadcasting stations owned and operated by the states and by colleges and universities, and also to permit such stations to use such hours and amounts of power as may be necessary in serving the purposes for which they exist. We believe that proper presentation by the Governors' conference sitting as a national unit to Senators Couzens and Dill, who are leaders in radio legislative thought, will eventually bring about the relief necessary when the new radio bill is enacted at the next session of Congress. We urge your cooperation."⁵

The members of the Association also, individually, wired their university presidents, urging them to send wires to the Governors' Conference. This action was part of the efforts on the part of educational broadcasters to have a group of frequencies set aside for their use. The Congress was in the process of considering new legislation to replace the Radio Act of 1927, and the educational broadcasters felt this was the ideal time to establish, once and for all, their place in the broadcasting field.

At this 1930 convention a new constitution was adopted, but the changes were of a minor nature. Associate membership was expanded to include any educational institution; i.e., those not operating stations. Associate members were given all the privileges of active members except the right to vote or hold office. Dues were

raised to \$10.00 for actives and \$7.00 for associates. From subsequent correspondence we learn that dues for associate membership were lowered to \$3.00 by action of the officers and executive committee.

It was decided at this meeting that the organization would profit by having someone act as Executive Secretary. This job, would, because of finances, have to be voluntary and the group agreed that Association President Robert Higgy, Director of WOSU, Ohio State University, should appoint someone from his staff to take over these duties. However, from later correspondence, we learn that Higgy assumed these duties himself.

From a report of the convention we learn that this meeting was considered very successful and an important milestone in the history of the organization. It was agreed that individual stations could not hope to make much progress with the FRC, but as a unified group they felt that they could do better. They hoped that the selection of an Executive Secretary, plus a regular news bulletin (the first of which was sent out by Higgy in September, 1930), would enable the members to be better informed of what the rest of the membership was doing. At the IER the educational stations had been criticized for not having a better knowledge of what their brethren were doing and this was given as one reason why so many educational stations were unsuccessful.

At the convention President Higgy announced that he had received a tentative offer, from an unnamed source, to pay the travel expenses for one representative from each active member station to attend "an annual, centrally located conference."⁶ However, this financial aid apparently never materialized.

Chapter IV

THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE

The plans for better coordination and a more unified organization made at the first annual convention in 1930 had to be carried out if the ACUBS, and possibly even educational broadcasting itself, was to continue to exist. The next few years were to see a bitter struggle between educational broadcasters on the one hand and commercial broadcasters and the FRC on the other. This struggle was especially difficult for the educators because this was a period of economic depression and many educational stations were having a difficult time getting enough money from their university administrations to continue operations.

The mimeographed "Bulletin" sent out by President Higgy in October, 1930 cites one example of the struggle with commercial stations. WCAJ, Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln, Nebraska, shared time on its frequency with WOW, commercial station in Omaha. Following are excerpts from the opening speech of Mr. Paul M. Segal, counsel for WOW, at the hearing before the FRC on the application by WOW for full time use of the shared frequency:

"WCAJ is a station of an educational institution reported to give educational programs. Our contention is that as a matter of principle educational programs should be given by stations having regular listening audiences, stations that have developed regular audiences of 'listeners-in' and not sporadic audiences. It seems that service should be given from a station that has a general and not a specialized value. It should be developed from the point of view of the people that have the means of maintaining interest, not people who might be susceptible to educational programs. Programs should come from a station that has diversified educational resources.....(WCAJ) spends less in a year than is spent by WOW in one week. WOW desires to take the responsibility of rendering the service to the public."

It was indirectly reported that NBC had threatened WOW with loss of their affiliation if they didn't get full time, and Armstrong Perry, of the United States Office of Education, was quoted as saying, "If this (the report) is true, it is time for the states to decide whether they want programs from stations in the state to be dominated by New York or whether they wish to retain some privileges of their own."

The members of ACUBS were not alone in their struggle for more rights for educational broadcasters. On October 13, 1930, a Conference on Radio and Education, called by U. S. Commissioner of Education William J. Cooper, was held in Chicago. At this meeting two important resolutions were passed.⁷ The first resolved that a committee should be established "for the purpose of formulating definite plans and recommendations for protecting and promoting broadcasting originating in educational institutions and broadcast by educational institutions, and for presenting the same, when advisable, to appropriate authorities and interested parties." The proposed

committee was to include representatives of ACUBS, the Land Grant Colleges Association, the National University Extension Association, the National Association of State University Presidents, other similar organizations and the Payne Fund, a philanthropic organization.

The other resolution recommended "that the Congress of the United States enact legislation which will permanently and exclusively assign to educational institutions and government educational agencies a minimum of fifteen (15) per cent of all radio broadcasting channels which are or may become available to the United States."

This conference and the first resolution quoted above resulted in the formation, in January, 1931, of the National Committee on Education by Radio (NCER). This committee, made possible by a five-year, \$200,000 grant from the Payne Fund, played an important role in educational broadcasting through the next several years.

On December 10, 1930, at the invitation of Mr. Levering Tyson, Director, National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, a small committee from the ACUBS (composed of Higgy; T. M. Beaird, Director, WNAD, University of Oklahoma; J. C. Jensen, Director, WCAJ, Nebraska Wesleyan University; and W. I. Griffith, Director, WOI, Iowa State College) met in Chicago with Tyson and Mr. Armstrong Perry "to formulate a report stating the present needs and difficulties of college and university stations. This report will be forwarded to the presidents of all colleges and universities, as well as the (ACUBS) membership."⁸

Another important forward step was hopefully considered by the leaders of ACUBS in 1930. They envisioned a network of educational stations which would enable the stations to present better programs and to compete on a more even basis with commercial broadcasters. In a mimeographed letter to all members President Higgy reported:

"The Payne Fund and another group interested in the development of education by radio have proposed that a network of educational stations would better serve the country. Indirectly, reports indicate that financial assistance might even be forthcoming to a properly organized program. A representative will be at our proposed July meeting to discuss this project."

However, the official minutes of that meeting (the first annual convention) do not indicate that the representative appeared, but the idea of a network or exchange of programs in some manner did not die.

A perusal of correspondence among the officers and of the sporadic "Bulletins" of 1931 reveals that several of the members were in favor of establishing a script exchange, whereby copies of the better dramatic scripts would be sent to the Executive Secretary for duplication and distribution to the member stations. This was started on a limited basis, and, in subsequent years, was helpful to many of the stations. However, this was not considered a substitute for the actual exchange of programs among stations.

Some members also favored an exchange of musical records, but this plan did not succeed to any extent. Most of the stations only used recordings on a limited basis and then only those that could be borrowed from local record stores.

During this period efforts were made to obtain copies of transcriptions of educational lectures that the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education was making available to the commercial networks. There was also an increase in the exchange of information among members.

In 1931 T. M. Beaird, WNAD, University of Oklahoma, became Executive Director, a position which he held for four years, and his untiring efforts had much to do with the growth and success of the script exchange and the "Bulletin." Because of constant reminders from Beaird, the exchange of ideas about programming, engineering and other problems became quite active. The members sent their ideas, problems and suggestions to Beaird who incorporated them in the "Bulletin." This exchange of ideas and an awareness that others had the same problems brought about a closer relationship among the member stations, and the organization became stronger in spite of the many difficulties encountered.

At this time there were 59 stations owned and operated by educational institutions, but 10 of these operated commercially.⁹ Of the remaining 49 stations, only 25 were active, dues-paying members of the ACUBS. The organization was still having trouble getting over 50% membership. There was an association of agricultural broadcasters and many of the agricultural colleges operating radio stations preferred membership in this association rather than the ACUBS.

The lack of money was still a problem. The practice was for the Secretary-Treasurer to send bills for dues to all educational stations in the country, whether they were then members or not, in the hope that many non-members would join. A letter explaining the ACUBS was usually sent with each bill. As Mr. B. B. Brackett (Director, KUSD, University of South Dakota), then Secretary-Treasurer, said in such a letter accompanying the 1931 bill for dues, "As you know, various questions about the future of real educational broadcasting stations are now up for serious consideration. This Association is making an effort to place itself in a position to be of real service to all educational broadcasters."

During this depression period most of the stations were having financial difficulties and many of them began commercial operation while others were tempted. Even J. C. Jensen, one of the earliest and staunchest supporters of the organization wrote that he was tempted to sell a little time in order to ease his budgetary problems.

The FRC was not making matters any easier. Some of their regulatory changes resulted in more expense. For example, stations had been allowed a 100 cycle deviation from assigned frequency. When the FRC reduced this to 50 cycles many stations found it necessary to install new and expensive equipment. Letters from several members indicate that this was a serious problem and they did all in their power to fight the change. This same expense was incurred by commercial operators, but the educational broadcasters felt that the commercial stations were in better financial position to afford the new equipment.

As mentioned earlier, the National Committee on Education by Radio (NCER) was formed in January, 1931, and its influence was soon felt. Through its efforts a bill was introduced into Congress (by Senator Simeon D. Fess of Ohio) reserving 15% of all radio channels for educational broadcasting. This, it will be recalled, was in line with the resolution passed at the Chicago meeting the previous fall. At the time 6.01% of facilities (according to the then current system of quota units) were used by educational stations. In addition to its efforts for reserved channels, the NCER had two other major projects under way: 1) Through a Service Bureau they offered assistance to college and university stations in their difficulties with the FRC, and 2) They published and distributed widely a weekly bulletin of news concerning educational broadcasting designed to awaken the interest of the public. The members of ACUBS were urged to support the program of the NCER.

especially the reservation of channels. They were urged to get support for the Fess bill, and to write, and get their college presidents to write, to their Congressmen. Although they did not expect the bill to pass at that session of Congress, they thought it might at a later session if sufficient support could be obtained.¹⁰

However, from correspondence, we learn that certain officers of the ACUBS did not favor the Fess bill, believing that educational broadcasters could profit more from being friendly with the commercial operators. Other Association leaders felt that reservation of channels was essential because educational stations were being forced to relinquish their broadcast licenses or to sell to commercial interests because of unfair treatment at the hands of the FRC. The FRC frequently restricted educational stations to low power, gave them poor frequencies, or, in many cases where time was shared with a commercial station, assigned the least desirable operating time to the educational station. As B. B. Brackett wrote in a letter to T. M. Beaird (December 15, 1931):

"The only chance that I can see for educational stations to get fair treatment and what they really need is to have them legally entitled to more than they can use (emphasis added) and to have the right to trade with commercials for excess privileges....This is why it seems to me that educational broadcasters as a whole should have a right to 15% or about that per cent of the broadcasting rights."

Further evidence of the growing interest in a system of program exchange is found in the official minutes of the 1931 convention, which was held in Columbus, Ohio, June 8 - 10, in conjunction with the IER:

"Resolved, that the Association of College and University Broadcasting Stations go on record as favoring development of exchange programs, and respectfully request that the National Committee on Education by Radio finance a demonstration of the preparation of such a program."

In 1932, the problems facing educational broadcasters increased. More stations were forced out of existence -- some for financial reasons, and some because they felt they couldn't continue to operate in the face of the unfair treatment at the hands of the FRC.

The budgetary problems of the depression years may be shown by the case of WAFI, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, which was forced to lease its facilities to commercial interests on August 1, 1932. In a letter, Mr. P. O. Davis, Executive Secretary of the institution, said:

"We discontinued our educational broadcasting because of the tragic condition of state finances. Many school salaries were more than a year in arrears..... My experience causes me to conclude that a state educational institution is out of its place when it tries to operate a radio station. Instead of operating a station, we should present programs the same as we present news features in the newspapers. We were never able to work out a satisfactory system of educational broadcasting, because we never had the funds for it. With us it was a matter of keeping the station going in order to hold our place on the air."¹¹

Some stations faced both problems; i.e., not enough financial support and unfair treatment by the FRC and commercial interests. KUOA, University of Arkansas, was one of these stations:

"The broadcasting experience of the University was characterized by Dr. J. C. Futrall, president, as 'very discouraging.' Three reasons are given by him for this condition. First, the University did not have sufficient funds to build a station that would be adequate to reach and serve the entire state properly. Second, though at first the University was given a good place on the dial and full time for broadcasting, from time to time its frequency was shifted and the allotted time reduced until, finally, the station was located so far down the dial as to make reception under the most favorable conditions uncertain over large sections of its service area, and only about one-quarter of the original time for broadcasting was allowed, and this the poorest of the day, the best hours being given to station KLRA (commercial). After the station was sold, its commercial owners were able to get full daylight time on a wavelength as good as that held by the University in 1925. This experience convinced the University authorities that 'the Federal Radio Commission was not going to treat the educational radio stations in such a way that they could function efficiently, but that it gave all the advantage to the commercial stations. We never knew when we would be put to a considerable expense to hold our place on the dial or to get and keep satisfactory hours for broadcasting.' Third, after the novelty wore off, it was difficult to get a continuous supply of satisfactory educational programs. Members of the faculty were not interested in preparing papers, lectures and courses of study for the radio. Consequently it became necessary to use considerable material from other sources, such as USDA reports, electrical transcribed records, and the like. In view of these facts, President Futrall states: 'A small university like ours, located in a small town, cannot, without undue expense, maintain and operate a radio station that would cover its territory and give its people the kind of programs they could expect from an institution of this type....Under present conditions, I doubt whether the University of Arkansas would accept a radio station, even if someone offered to give us free of charge a good one.'"¹²

Further light is shed on the situation that existed at the University of Arkansas, and the opinion of the FRC held by officials of the University, in a statement by Dean A. M. Harding, Extension Division, quoted by B. B. Brackett in a letter to T. N. Beaird, dated February 2, 1932. Professor Harding is quoted as saying, "The men (the FRC)....merely cut off the arms, legs and head of an educational station and then allow it to die a natural death." In the same letter Brackett says:

"It is my opinion that all school owned stations should remain purely educational and non-commercial, if they can possibly do so; and further I think it desirable and imperative that every real educational station try to keep whatever license privileges it now has without regard to how many may be forced out of existence. As long as there is a single school-owned educational station, it has a normal or ethical right to a certain amount of the broadcasting privileges, and I think there are those who can get this fact before the public that will grant a hearing, even if most of the broadcast stations should come under the monopolistic control that will censor anything not pleasing to the owners of the big stations."

This general attitude of the educational broadcasters toward the FRC and the commercial broadcasters is illustrated by experiences of two or three educational stations during the early 1930's. WEMC, Emmanuel Missionary College, Barien Springs, Michigan, was forced to sell its facilities to a commercial station on August 29, 1930, because,

"Though the purposes of the station 'were realized to an encouraging extent,' the fact that the FRC restricted the time the station could broadcast -- first by ordering that it divide its frequency with (other stations), and then that it operate only during the daytime hours -- and decreased its power so as greatly to limit its field of service eventually caused the College authorities to conclude that the expense of operating the station was altogether too great for the value received."¹³

KFMX, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota, allowed its license to expire on April 1, 1933. It had shared time with the University of Minnesota, St. Olaf's College, and a commercial station, and the three educational stations had had to fight constantly against efforts by the commercial station to get exclusive rights to the frequency. In light of expensive litigation, poor hours of operation, etc., the college was unwilling to spend the money necessary to operate a station. Dr. C. A. Culver, station director, said, "As a result of our experience of nearly a decade, we are convinced that there are almost unlimited educational possibilities inherent in broadcasting, and that these possibilities can never be realized until the Federal Government sets aside definite frequencies for the exclusive use of educational institutions." Three reasons were given for the final abandonment of broadcasting by Carleton College: (1) unsatisfactory frequency assignment, (2) continuous and expensive litigation with the commercial station operating on the same frequency, and (3) expense of operation, particularly under the above conditions.¹⁴

Businessmen all over the country attempted to get educational stations to sell time. In view of the very precarious financial position of many educational stations and the difficulty of staying on the air during the depression, several educational broadcasters began to sell time, some leased their facilities to commercial interests, and some sold out to commercial stations. (The reader's attention is again invited to Appendix B.)

These developments were discouraging to some of the ACUBS leaders. They felt commercial broadcasting was becoming more dominant and that educational radio per se was in imminent danger of complete collapse. This general feeling of discouragement was evident in many of the letters exchanged during the period. Officers of the ACUBS felt that the Association should do something to bolster the weakening defenses, but did not know what to do, and they were worried.

Early in 1932, the Senate, in an effort to get pertinent facts about the entire broadcasting problem, instructed the FRC to determine what educational programs were being carried by both the educational and commercial stations throughout the country. The FRC selected the week that had been designated National Education Week as the week for which they requested information from the stations about educational broadcasts. Naturally, during the week, the commercial stations put on more programs of an educational nature than they would normally, and educational broadcasters felt this was unfair.¹⁵

The FRC request resulted in an exchange of correspondence between ACUBS officers as to how the term "educational" should be interpreted for the FRC questionnaire. In the January and February "Bulletins" advice was given to interpret the term in

the broadest possible sense. This resulted in some of the member stations including such broadcasts as sporting events. Immediately the National Association of Broadcasters issued a bulletin, in which a copy of the ACUBS "Bulletin" was included, questioning the honesty and motives of the Association in suggesting such an interpretation.¹⁶

About this time an article appeared in Broadcasting magazine bitterly attacking the educational stations. The article claimed that, based on NCER figures,¹⁷ of the 49 educational stations in the country sold time. The article also stated that educational stations weren't broadcasting as many educational programs as were commercial stations, and the educational stations were criticized for not using all of the hours of operation allotted to them by the FRC and for not operating their stations during the summer months.¹⁷

The FRC report to the Senate, supposedly based on the questionnaire results, said that educational stations were not necessary, because there were ample facilities in the commercial group to present all the education that people wanted, and further that the commercial operators were willing, in every way, to cooperate in educational matters. There was a suggestion that, if the educational broadcasters wanted to operate efficiently, they should join together in a telephone network.¹⁸ This FRC report apparently incensed the ACUBS leaders, and, in some of the letters, we find rather nasty comments about how much A. T. & T. stock might be owned by Commission members, or how much "rake-off" they might be getting.

The FRC also was apparently trying to force the educational stations to change to undesirable frequencies, or to alter their time sharing agreements. These, the ACUBS officers felt, were merely devices by which the FRC was attempting to get as many of the educational stations as possible to relinquish their licenses. It is worthwhile, at this point, to cite one example of the manner in which the FRC attempted to force ridiculous changes on educational stations in order to discourage them. WNAD, University of Oklahoma, was ordered to alter its time-sharing agreement with a commercial station in such a manner as would limit WNAD to five hours of broadcasting a week, or, as the only alternative require them to operate 63 hours each week. At that time it was practically impossible for an educational station to program so many hours. However, fortunately for educational broadcasters, WNAD was able to get the FRC to alter this ruling.¹⁹

All of these activities resulted in a request from the officers of ACUBS that member stations prepare a statement on the difficulties that had been encountered in the way of frequency assignments, power, hours of operation, shared time, and similar problems, in dealings with the FRC. These statements were then sent to the Executive Secretary who published them in the "Bulletin," with copies going to Congressmen.²⁰

Apparently the majority of Congress was not impressed by the actions of the FRC and the commercial broadcasters. As Mr. Armstrong Perry, Director, NCER Service Bureau, pointed out in a letter to B. B. Brackett on March 12, 1932:

"From all indications Congress, as well as the Supreme Court, is firmly opposed to the monopoly of broadcasting channels by any one business concern, but it is taking a great deal of work to make Congress realize that the States have rights in radio. They are still playing with the idea that forcing all stations to give a percentage of their time to education would meet the situation. Of course, educators know that this would be no more satisfactory than putting University lectures into a motion picture theater."

The NCER was still active in its efforts in behalf of educational broadcasting. At this time the NCER was waging a campaign, through correspondence, urging influential people in the various communities, states and regions to lend increased financial support to educational stations.²¹

Actually, educational broadcasters were not being imposed upon to the extent many claimed. Many of their troubles were self-inflicted, and they were a little too prone to blame others for some of their own shortcomings. Though many factors were uncontrollable, educational broadcasters should have shown a more acute awareness of actual conditions.

This fact was brought out by Mr. C. M. Jansky, Jr., Consulting Radio Engineer from Washington, D. C., in a report presented before the Second Annual Assembly of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education:²²

"It is a fact too often overlooked that the first broadcast stations in the United States were operated by educational institutions several years prior to the beginnings of the so-called commercial stations. In other words, in the general scheme of broadcasting in the United States our educational institutions at the start of things were distinctly in on the ground floor."

Mr. Jansky went on to quote from an address made by Herbert Hoover at the opening of the Third National Radio Conference in October, 1924, to point out that of the 533 stations then (1924) in operation, 85 of them were owned by educational institutions. Jansky said that files of the FRC showed that between October, 1924, and May 11, 1927, the number of educational stations dropped to 69. By May 26, 1931, there were only 42.

"The decrease since May, 1927, according to Commission records, was due almost entirely to the voluntary surrender of licenses by the institutions themselves or their transfer to commercial organizations....In the face of the alarming decrease in the number of educational stations since the early days of broadcasting, it becomes our first duty to scrutinize the events of the past 12 years with the view of determining, if possible, just what has been the cause. If broadcasting is the great potential educational force we now all believe it to be, why has the number of educational stations decreased 50% in the past eight years? There are those who do not hesitate to suggest an answer. They insist that the decline of the educational station has been due to the hostile attitude of the commercial stations as a group, and to the active cooperation of those vested with authority to regulate radio communication in a vigorous campaign to entirely eliminate the educator from the broadcast field. Now this is indeed a serious charge and should turn our attention to a careful survey of the facts to see whether or not the contention has merit!"

Mr. Jansky then pointed out that the First National Radio Conference in 1922 recommended, and the resulting regulations provided, special consideration for educational stations. Frequency bands were assigned on the basis of four classifications and preferential treatment given accordingly. The Conference had recommended that "subject to public interest and the reasonable requirements of each type of service" the order of priority of the broadcast services should be government, public (that is, "broadcasting by public institutions and universities and such others as

might be licensed for the purpose of disseminating informational and educational service"), private and toll (commercial). As Jansky pointed out,

"In other words the educational station certainly started its career with a silver spoon in its mouth, at least so far as the regulatory authority was concerned, and it started with preferential consideration second only to that accorded the stations owned by the Federal Government itself."

Mr. Jansky reminded his audience that Herbert Hoover had continually admonished those in attendance at the National Radio Conferences to bear in mind the importance of radio as an educational medium and provide adequately for those stations whose prime aim was education.

"Why was it that in spite of government patronage and assistance, the activities of the educational stations did not flourish as contrasted with those of the commercial stations? Why at that time were the special frequency bands provided for these stations so little used? Why at a later date were the educational stations so easily crowded off the better assignments by the commercial stations?"

Jansky's opinion, in answer to his own questions, was that early educational stations were developed primarily by engineers, with very little publicity, and educators as a whole paid little attention to what was going on. The pioneer was the engineer and not the specialist in education nor the educational administrator. And the engineer wasn't able to arouse the interest and the enthusiasm of educators or college administrators in the educational possibilities of the new medium.

"I know, because I tried to do this and I know that my scientific colleagues in other schools tried it also."

Commercial organizations on the other hand were quick to realize the value of the medium for reaching the public. As a result commercial stations increased rapidly in number. When conditions became such that interference and other problems arose, it was inevitable that the farsighted commercial operators would do everything possible, and use every means, to improve and strengthen their position. While educators were wondering whether to enter into broadcasting, the commercial operators realized that facilities would be limited and they had better get them while they could.

Jansky pointed out that the rate of decline in educational stations had been about the same before and after the inception of the FRC. Therefore, educational broadcasters should not try to place the blame on the Commission.

"As I look back over the record of events since the inauguration of the examiner system I cannot avoid the conclusion that the Commission has given every consideration to the educational station which could be justified on the basis of the record before it. Indeed, there are instances where it has seemed to me that even where the educational station has been negligent in supplying the facts to which the Commission is entitled, every thing possible has been done to protect its rights....the prime reason for the loss of ground by the educational station is due to the fact that, with few exceptions, if any, our leading administrators and educators have to date never looked upon their broadcasting stations as major activities worthy of promotion and of defense with

every ounce of resource against all comers. In the life and death struggle for existence which has been going on in the broadcast field it is difficult to win even with an umpire who at heart wants you to, when you yourself are not certain that you have any business in the field at all."

As for the future, Mr. Jansky believed there was definitely a place for the educational station, "providing the management of the stations involved are prepared to accept the responsibility incumbent upon them." He said he could visualize the ideal educational station of the future but that it would have to meet the following specifications:

- 1) The station will not be under any other department of the University but will be considered as and operated as a major activity of the institution and treated as such.
- 2) Those in charge of the station will realize the responsibilities, possibilities and limitations of radio, and they will assist those who as teachers build and produce broadcast material.
- 3) Those appearing on programs will not consider this secondary but of primary importance.
- 4) The station will not seek special privileges, but will welcome the opportunity of competing for an audience and public interest with the very best that the commercial station has to offer.
- 5) The station will take an active part in the life of the community.
- 6) The station will study public reaction to its broadcasting.
- 7) The station will not shrink from any of the obligations which the public, through its authorized regulatory authorities, may see fit to impose upon it. If it is supposed to broadcast 60 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, it will do it even if "it becomes necessary to broadcast purely entertainment or sponsored programs."
- 8) The station will not be poverty stricken.

At the conclusion of Mr. Jansky's report, Mr. Armstrong Perry pointed out that some educational stations were deprived of the right to broadcast public events or service features because of their time sharing agreements and the unwillingness of the commercial station sharing the frequency to relinquish the time desired by the educational station.

He cited one example where the commercial station sharing its frequency with WNYC, New York City municipal station, refused to relinquish a part of its assigned time to allow WNYC to broadcast an important speech by the then Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes. The commercial station subsequently made the bar association pay them for broadcasting the talk. Mr. Perry said,

"Neither the FRC nor the broadcasting industry is willing to admit that a state has any more right to the use of a public broadcasting channel for instructing its citizens than a broadcaster has, even though he may be a quack doctor, as has been the case in one state, who wants to use the air for his own private profit. So the question really is, do we want to submit to the regulation of

radio by the people whom we elect to rule over us, or do we want to leave our radio channels in the hands of private concerns and private interests who wish to use these public radio channels for their own profit?"

The arguments presented by Mr. Jansky are basically the same being presented twenty odd years later by persons desiring to abolish the present reservation of television channels for educational stations. Also, probably all educational broadcasters would agree with nearly all of the concepts laid down by Mr. Jansky for an ideal educational station.

However, there was considerable merit in the statements made by Mr. Jansky as to the real cause of the ills of the educational broadcasters, though he did not mention the financial problem which undoubtedly played a major role in the matter because of the severe limitations placed on most college and university budgets by the depression.

Because of the many grievances held against the FRC, there was an effort late in 1932 to get J. C. Jensen, Director of WCAJ, Nebraska Wesleyan University, appointed to the FRC to represent the Fourth District. (For regulatory purposes the country was at that time divided into five radio districts.) Several members of the ACUBS wrote to President Hoover and to their Congressmen and there was some indication that several Congressmen were in favor of such an appointment. The correspondence of that period indicates that the ACUBS not only urged member stations to support Jensen's appointment, but to get official backing from their parent institutions. A list in the files of the ACUBS showing some of those persons in favor of the appointment of Jensen is quite impressive. It includes the names of several Senators and Representatives, Federal judges, Vice-President Curtis, Dr. Lee DeForest, presidents of many national organizations, outstanding professors and deans, religious leaders, superintendents of schools, and university presidents.

Subsequently, in February, 1933, President Hoover did appoint Jensen to the FRC, but since Roosevelt and the Democrats had won the 1932 election, there was no chance of getting the appointment confirmed by the Senate.²³ Therefore, the leaders of the Association debated whether or not the ACUBS should continue to support Jensen, or should "swing to a good Democratic educator who might stand a better chance." Dr. Bruce Mahon, Dean of Extension Division, University of Iowa, was considered to be the best man to back in the latter case, and he was also apparently the choice of the NCER. However, there was a feeling that Roosevelt had already decided on an appointee and that no educator had a chance of securing the appointment.

The main interest of the Association was to have a competent educator appointed to the Commission, and after a meeting with the NCER in Washington in March it was decided that Jensen did not have a chance of being confirmed and that the appointment would go to a Democrat. Therefore, it was decided to back Mahon for the appointment.²⁴ This attempt, too, was unsuccessful and Roosevelt failed to appoint an educator to the Commission.

In spite of the great concern the Association felt about its relations with the FRC and the commercial operators, other ACUBS activities were not ignored. There was still agitation for program exchange. Carl Menzer, WSUI, State University of Iowa, considered the possibility of building a recorder -- none of the stations could afford to buy one, apparently -- which could be used on a round-robin basis by the member stations and the resultant programs offered to any ACUBS member desiring to use them. Levering Tyson, NACRE, indicated that he would make an attempt to finance the construction of the recorder if the cost would not be too great.²⁵ However, records of later years indicate that this plan did not materialize until six years later.

During the next few years, the problems facing educational broadcasters changed little. The ACUBS membership remained small (there were only 20 active dues paying members in 1933), trouble with the FRC and the commercial stations continued, and the educators continued efforts to improve their broadcasting by exchange of ideas and scripts and planned for the day of large-scale program exchange.

The educational stations were still assigned poor frequencies, required to share time and to operate at low power. This latter especially was cause for resentment. The allocation system then in effect provided certain quotas, computed mathematically by power and hours of operation, and yet the FRC permitted commercial stations to increase power quite frequently without altering the quota. This, from the point of view of the educators, was in violation of the intent of the law.²⁶

ACUBS members also realized a need for continuing improvement in educational broadcasting methods and program content. This was achieved to some extent by the exchange of ideas through the "Bulletins" issued by the Executive Secretary, T. M. Beaird. Beaird requested certain outstanding men in educational broadcasting to write special papers for the enlightenment of the membership. One of these written in February, 1933, by Dr. F. H. Lumley, Research Associate, Ohio State University, was entitled "The Needs of Educational Broadcasting," and set forth the following conditions which Dr. Lumley felt handicapped the further development of radio as an educational medium:

- 1) Lack of adequate publicity for educational programs.
- 2) Lack of balance and appropriateness in the presentation of educational programs.
- 3) Lack of syndicated educational features, either available by wire transmission or recording.
- 4) Lack of adequate remuneration for educational talent.
- 5) Lack of development of listener organizations.

Here, neatly summed up, are the problems that have faced educational broadcasters through the years. In fact, though some of these problems have been solved, some of them are still very much evident.

After 1933, the problems of the Association did not lessen to any notable extent, although matters seemed to take a turn for the better. The membership had been reduced to the hard core of ever-faithful -- those men truly devoted to the cause of educational broadcasting. In ACUBS records the names of the same men appear year after year and their letters to one another, though pointing out the problems, are filled with a zeal which is not to be denied. One era in the history of educational broadcasting ended after 1933, partially because of the reasons stated above, but also, and possibly even more so, because 1934 saw the transition of the ACUBS into the National Association of Educational Broadcasters (NAEB).

Chapter V

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS

The 1934 convention was scheduled to be held in Columbus, in May, in connection with the IER. However, so few members attended that no officers were elected, and it was decided that a meeting should be held in the fall. Subsequently, the organization met September 10 and 11, in Kansas City. At this meeting a new constitution was adopted and the name of the organization was changed to The National Association of Educational Broadcasters.

Both the change in name and the change in the constitution were due to the increasing number of educational institutions broadcasting over commercial outlets who were reluctant to join the organization under limited membership. The new constitution provided that any college or university broadcasting regular educational programs, either over its own facilities or on a commercial station, was eligible for full membership.²⁷

This 1934 convention was important for another reason. The Federal Communications Act of 1934 had established the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), and, in addition, had stipulated that the FCC should study a proposal that Congress set aside, by law, certain frequencies for educational broadcasting and report back to the Congress by February 1, 1935. Therefore, the very first order of the new FCC was as follows:²⁸

"Pursuant to the provisions of Section 307 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as follows: 'The Commission shall study the proposal that Congress by Statute allocate fixed percentages of radio broadcasting facilities to particular types or kinds of non-profit radio programs or to persons identified with particular types or kinds of non-profit activities, and shall report to Congress not later than February 1, 1935, its recommendations together with the reasons for the same.' IT IS ORDERED, that any person or licensee (of a radio broadcast station) desiring to submit information to the Commission concerning any matter referred to in said section may do so by appearing in person or by attorney at a hearing to be held at the offices of the Federal Communications Commission beginning at 10:00 a.m. on October 1, 1934, and continuing from day to day until completed. Written notice of intention to appear at said hearing should be furnished the Commission not later than September 20, 1934. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, that the Secretary cause copies of this order to be sent to all licensees of radio broadcast stations and any other parties known to be interested in said matters."

Association President Josef F. Wright, WILL, University of Illinois, appointed a committee of Harold G. Ingham, University of Kansas, chairman; Carl Menzer, State University of Iowa; H. B. McCarty, University of Wisconsin; and W. E. Phillips, University of Illinois; to receive, compile and summarize members' ideas on this problem of reservation, and to present a report at the Kansas City meeting.²⁹

Educational broadcasters were concerned not only with the reservation of channels, they wanted the reserved channels to be in a satisfactory portion of the spectrum. Earlier in the year the old FRC had tentatively proposed to put all educational stations on an experimental basis and on frequencies between 1500 and 1600 kilocycles.³⁰

Apparently the advantages of this sort of arrangement -- separate frequencies, fewer time-sharing problems, no Canadian or Mexican interference, freedom from smothering effect of super-powered stations on adjacent channels -- were outweighed by the disadvantages -- expense of changing equipment or buying new equipment and the very important fact that comparatively few receivers then in existence, especially in the middle west and northwest, were equipped to receive signals above 1500 kc. As B. B. Brackett said in a letter:

"I feel that it is being suggested to us to take what no other stations want; and judging from the past I would say that if we should take the proposed frequency allotment and make a success of using it, high powered commercials would soon be crowding in and upon us until we would be no better off than at present!"

This same opinion was shared by others, and it was pointed out that signals wouldn't carry as far on the higher frequencies. This was important because of the large rural areas that most of the educational stations tried to cover.³¹

From correspondence and "Bulletins" we learn that member stations acted very promptly in sending their grievances and problems to the committee named above. Many of these have been recounted at some length earlier in this paper. A report was prepared, presented to the convention, and subsequently President Wright represented the NAEB at the hearing called by the FCC.

At the same time, the commercial operators were doing everything possible to convince the FCC that channels should not be reserved for educational broadcasting. An editorial appearing in Radio Guide, September 15, 1934, attacked the proposal that one-fourth of all frequencies be reserved:³²

"In the mass, Americans are more interested in education than are the people of any other nation. But they do not want education thrust down their throats-- or into their ears.....You can't force education on a nation. No one has found a way of making the three R's attractive enough to overcome the lure of a good radio drama, or the broadcast of a symphony orchestra, or of good popular music. But there are types of educational programs to which the public does respond -- and these programs are available today....The National Broadcasting Company devotes more than twenty per cent of its time to highly educational features. The Columbia Broadcasting System runs a little higher. The country's foremost educators are all agreed upon the usefulness of radio as an educational medium, but many of them are equally certain that a method of broadcasting academic subjects effectively has not been discovered....(Educators) failed in their stewardship of the frequencies allotted them in years gone by. In 1922 there were seven colleges broadcasting; in 1923 there were twenty-seven colleges on the air, and today there are only twenty-seven. What reason have they for asking for the assignment of one hundred and fifty broadcast wave lengths, when so little has been accomplished with those they have?"

At the conclusion of the hearings, the FCC did not recommend that channels be reserved for educational broadcasting, and the problems confronting educational broadcasters continued for many years. It was not until the allocation of FM channels, several years later that the need for reserved channels was finally recognized.

The problem of satisfactory program exchange between educational broadcasters was still in the minds of Association leaders during this period. During the summer of 1934 action was initiated to get departments of the Federal Government to distribute to educational stations transcriptions dealing with departmental activities. However, this attempt was unsuccessful,³³ and, at the Kansas City meeting, three committees dealing with program exchange were appointed: 1) Committee on Federal Chain Educational Program Development (Frank E. Schooley, University of Illinois, chairman), 2) Committee on Short Wave Transmission between Stations (Carl Menzer, State University of Iowa, chairman), and 3) Committee on Proposed Recorded Programs (T. M. Beard, University of Oklahoma, chairman).³⁴

This increased activity in connection with program exchange continued into 1935, and the increased interest in the possibilities of an educational network became apparent. In March Menzer distributed a questionnaire to determine if a short wave network would be feasible. He pointed out in the accompanying letter that he had been able to pick up Iowa City (WOI) good enough for rebroadcast, as well as fairly good signals from a Cincinnati station which was carrying Ohio State programs, and WIXAL, World Wide Broadcasting Foundation station in Boston.³⁵

However, the answers to the questionnaire were not encouraging, and at the convention, held in Iowa City, September 9 and 10, 1935, Menzer reported that a tabulation of answers showed that at that time there was not enough suitable equipment owned by members to justify tests in short wave transmission. He thought that this condition might change in the future and, if so, tests might be made then.³⁶ The convention voted to continue Menzer's committee.

At the convention Schooley's committee on program development reported:

"....that inquiry had revealed a positive desire for programs prepared or recorded for use by the educational stations, and a hope that the Federal authorities might be willing to develop them or at least prepare suitable records from material furnished in part by the educational broadcasters."³⁷

One of the most exciting developments at the convention was the proposal for an educational network that would encompass the entire country. Dr. Arthur G. Crane, president of the University of Wyoming and chairman of the radio committee of the National Association of State Universities, speaking for the NCER, proposed a third national network (there were then only two -- NBC and CBS) to be called a public network. This network would be assigned 25% of the frequencies and would be operated by the government for the good and education of the people. The network would be controlled by a system of state, regional and national boards "selected as carefully as are judges." Non-profit public stations would be assured the right to join the network and carry its programs, and commercial stations would not be excluded.

"You directors of educational broadcasting know how valuable it would be to you in your program making to have the privilege of national hook-up. It would enrich your programs, increase your audiences, and multiply your usefulness... today non-profit public welfare stations share less than two per cent of the radio channels. 98% of America's broadcasting is commercial. One of the weapons used in crowding out public broadcasting stations was the privilege of hook-up with national chains. The plan proposes that this privilege shall be forever assured to the non-profit public stations....This service would make and distribute recordings of notable broadcasts....Particularly would such a library of recordings be valuable in public school broadcasting service. Such a service provided on a national scale would readily become self-supporting without undue expense to the local stations."³⁸

Dr. Crane had presented this idea earlier, on May 16, to the FCC, where it was well received. At the conclusion of the hearings, FCC Chairman Sykes announced that further study of the plans proposed for improving educational broadcasting would be made by a committee appointed by the FCC and headed by U. S. Commissioner of Education Dr. J. W. Studebaker.³⁹

There were other encouraging developments in 1935. In spite of the fact that the NAEB membership was still small (23 actives and 9 associate members), the financial condition of the Association had improved to the point where Treasurer Brackett wrote President Griffith to the effect that dues might be reduced, at least temporarily, back to \$5.00 and possibly \$3.00. And he felt that, if a good sized membership were maintained, they might never have to be increased again to \$10.00.

Exchange of scripts and other helpful information was stepped up as shown in this excerpt from a letter from newly elected Executive Secretary Harold Engel, WHA, University of Wisconsin, to all members:

"For some time we have discussed the desirability of having a central distributing agency to which we could send out our bulletins, outlines, scripts, form sheets, etc., and have them distributed to all our members. Inasmuch as no action was taken your secretary will take over the task and will hereafter get out a packet to each member regularly -- provided the members remember to send in their contributions to be distributed."

Subsequent correspondence indicates that the informational packets were sent out with some degree of regularity and that the members felt they were very valuable.

There were discouraging developments, too. The new Federal Communications Act and the formation of the FCC did little to lessen the fears of the educational broadcasters. The FCC proposed that qualification of applicants for existing licenses should be determined without the incumbent licensee having to appear at the hearing before the FCC. This was encouraging, but did not satisfy everyone in the NAEB because they felt that they could not afford the expensive litigation that might result when a qualified applicant applied for a channel then occupied by an educational station. They were in favor of not having to defend their rights to the channels they held, regardless of the merits of their programs as opposed to those proposed by the new applicant.⁴⁰

Chapter VI

THE INTERMEDIATE YEARS

If one were to pick a point at which the fortunes of the educational broadcasters seemed to improve -- not any sudden change, but the beginnings of better things to come -- he would probably have to choose the year 1936. While it is true that there were still financial problems, troubles with the FCC and commercial interests, and relatively small membership, conditions were definitely on the up-swing from the dark years immediately preceding 1936. The 1935 convention had seen encouragement in the matter of exchange of programs, ideas and information, and the position of educational broadcasting in general was more stable.

During this period more and more organizations rallied to the cause of educational broadcasting. And the new FCC was still attempting to improve general conditions. For example, in January, 1936, the FCC appointed 39 members, including NAEB President H. B. McCarty, to a newly formed Federal Radio Education Committee, chaired by U. S. Commissioner of Education Dr. J. W. Studebaker. The two-fold purpose of this new committee was to:

"1) Eliminate controversy and misunderstanding between groups of educators and between the industry and educators, and 2) promote actual cooperative arrangements between educators and broadcasters on national, regional and local bases."⁴¹

However, the educational broadcasters felt that one barrier to progress was the provision that the committee was limited to the work of eliminating controversy and promoting cooperation "within the present broadcasting structure."

The NCER, whose original five year grant from the Payne Fund had expired, was reorganized under a new two-year grant, "to promote the use of radio for educational, cultural, and civic purposes."⁴²

The FCC was still receiving testimony and exhibits relative to possible channel allocations. Because of this, the NAEB, through the cooperation of the Federal Radio Education Project and financial assistance from the NCER, gathered material for a brochure on educational stations to be presented to the FCC.⁴³

Also, the spring of 1936 saw the first real activity relative to the formation of a permanent headquarters and some type of program exchange. Levering Tyson, Director, National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, wrote to NAEB President McCarty asking him to gather and summarize ideas and suggestions about how educational broadcasting might be improved and to make recommendations as to activities the NACRE might undertake. In appointing a committee to consider this, McCarty said, "The large foundations, it is reported, are interested in knowing how they may assist the cause of Education by radio...."⁴⁴

The NAEB committee met in Madison, and the following is an excerpt from its report:

"Lack of funds to support a central organization is retarding the interchange of effective ideas and methods and the collective progress of these (educational) stations. Individual developments remain isolated, as it were. Co-operative enterprise needs stimulation and financial support. Suggested Activities: The first requirement would be that of securing a central headquarters and personnel. With capable leadership and help, a central organization could serve the cause of educational radio in a multitude of ways. It could increase the number of educational programs on the air, improve their quality, stimulate leadership, develop an understanding of fundamentals, and strengthen the position of true educational broadcasting. Among the services of great value which suggest themselves are: 1) Program and script exchange; 2) Recording service, special features -- to present....in the fields of children's programs, literature, social science, hygiene and other adaptable subjects for use and example; 3) Analysis of local conditions; 4) Organize educational forces within the service areas of the stations; 5) Conduct lectures, reaction surveys."

The budget suggested for such an operation included \$10,000.00 for salaries and \$8,000.00 for operation. Rent was to be waived by the institution where the central office might be located. This plan envisioned the production of programs and \$5,000.00 was allotted in the budget for talent -- writers and broadcasters. Capital expenditures (first year only) would total \$1,400.00. Although it was to be years before this dream was realized, the planning indicated that educational broadcasters were aware of their potentialities and needed only the necessary funds to put their plan into operation.

Leaders of the Association were not content with just plans for the future. An NAEB recorder to be used by all members finally became a reality as the result of a grant of \$500 from the NACRE. The recorder was purchased from the Universal Microphone Company for \$460.10, the balance of the grant being used for the "construction of a shipping crate."⁴⁵

Also, W. I. Griffith was trying to set up a relay system between midwest stations for mutual exchange of their best programs. Carl Menzer, chairman of the NAEB Committee on Short Wave Transmission between Stations, felt that such a direct relay system might work on a limited basis.

Nothing of great importance took place at the convention in 1936, held August 17-18 at Madison. However, the general discussions relative to station problems, recording techniques (brought about by the acquisition of the new NAEB recorder), program ideas and plans for a transcription library made up of the recordings that members would make with the new recorder, all reflected the general feeling of well-being.⁴⁶

During this year the Newsletter was started as the official publication and was issued with a certain degree of regularity by the Executive Secretary, Harold Engel. These early Newsletters indicate that the members were beginning to be quite active in the exchange of ideas and information.

On December 10-12, 1936, the American Council on Education held the first National Conference on Educational Broadcasting in Washington in cooperation with the U. S. Office of Education and the FCC. In a letter to NAEB President McCarty, inviting the NAEB to be one of the sponsoring organizations, C. S. Marsh, chairman of the conference planning committee, stated the purposes of the conference as follows:

"1) To discuss means by which radio may become a more effective instrument for education, both formal and informal, 2) to serve as a clearing house for information on the latest technical and professional developments in educational broadcasting, and 3) to enable persons representing all phases of the subject to become acquainted and to exchange ideas and experiences."

However, success was not being achieved on all fronts. Several stations were still having financial troubles and difficulties with the FCC. The FCC had ruled on several technical items, such as transmitter construction, which presented problems for some educational stations that did not have equipment which met the new standards and had no way of getting the money to make the necessary changes or replacements. The following excerpts from a letter, dated April 12, 1936, from B. B. Brackett, to H. B. McCarty, summarize this problem:

"Nearly everything that we are now using will almost certainly be condemned; and yet it is giving quite good results. The ruling seems to me quite like ordering all autos off the highways unless they are of the very latest type. Our situation is this. We do not have funds or income to pay for improved equipment....Our state legislature meets biennially and will not have a regular session until the early months of 1937. We have never had a real appropriation for broadcast equipment, and have therefore built parts and assembled our transmitters piece by piece. (Emphasis added)To make the situation worse, school funds of all kinds have been cut in this state in recent years until the general funds for the University are so low as to make it necessary to economize in every possible way....We have reasons to believe that our broadcasts over KUSD are helping materially to sell the University and its needs to our listeners over the state; and surely much of our public needs to know more about the University, its work, and what our students are doing... But if the proposed changes have to be made within too short a time, I do not know whether we can even survive. It is difficult for others....to understand our situation. It is necessary at times for us to withdraw or withhold a request for support, lest those above us decide that all broadcasting shall be abandoned and our license forfeited. In the second place, schools that are able to increase the power of their transmitters should be allowed to do so, and they should be granted wave channels that are reasonably free from interference, during the short (time) that the stations are on the air. They ought to have as good facilities as commercial stations, equally well equipped; but in many cases this is not granted."

This letter is testimony to the many and varied problems that faced most of the educational stations in this period. However, for the record, it should be reported that KUSD did get a new transmitter, built with NYA help, and also a new studio and control equipment.⁴⁷

The next few years failed to produce many changes in the educational broadcasting field. The NAEB recorder was used extensively and there was some exchange of programs. There was also more experimentation in rebroadcasting direct pick-ups

from other nearby stations. Too, some FCC decisions were more favorable toward educational broadcasters, as when in 1937 KSD, who shared time equally with KFUD, Concordia Theological Seminary, both in St. Louis, had its petition for full-time use of the channel denied on the grounds that KFUD was providing a service that could not be provided by a commercial station.⁴⁸ Also Congress passed resolutions calling for investigations into various aspects of the broadcasting industry. As S. Howard Evans, Secretary of the NCER, reported at the 1937 NAEB convention, held in Urbana, Illinois, September 13-14, "Things are in such a condition in Washington as to indicate that there is need for an explanation of radio's activities." He went on to say that "the admission by the industry's trade papers that a clean-up is expected is looked upon as an admission by the industry that a clean-up is needed."⁴⁹

Early in 1938 the FCC reserved 25 channels in the ultra-high (later FM) frequency band for non-profit educational broadcasting. "This class of stations will be authorized to transmit entertainment and educational programs to school classes and to the general public alike. The broadcast service to be rendered must be primarily of an educational character. No sponsored or commercial programs of any character may be broadcast."⁵⁰ Although these allocated frequencies were not in the regular broadcast band, this was the first such assignment by the FCC for exclusive educational channels and was considered a major victory by educational broadcasters. NAEB officers urged member stations to apply for FM licenses. Leaders in the broadcasting field felt that the entire future of broadcasting lay in this area.

"A prominent radio attorney also feels that educational institutions should go into this field of broadcasting because this is where the broadcast band is going to be in the future. He believes that if educational stations do not take advantage of this opportunity they are going to be in the same position as they are today with respect to the possibility of obtaining adequate broadcast facilities."⁵¹

However, correspondence and Newsletters from this period fail to show any great interest in FM on the part of most educational broadcasters.

The problem of a suitable means of program exchange still received a great deal of attention in 1938, and several stations began to exchange programs by transcription. A few rebroadcast programs of nearby stations by direct pick-up.⁵²

At the annual convention, held September 5-6, 1938, in Lexington, Kentucky, constitutional amendments relative to membership were proposed, and were later approved by mail vote of the membership. The major change restored to Associate status those institutions broadcasting over commercial outlets but not operating their own stations. Dues for Associate members were raised from \$2.50 to \$5.00 annually.⁵³ Convention delegates considered the possible influence on educational broadcasting the anticipated changes in frequencies, brought about by the North American Regional Broadcast Agreement reached in Havana earlier that year, might make. Mr. Maurice M. Jansky, Radio Consultant, spoke at length on the effect of the agreement on educational stations. He pointed out that many of them would have to change frequencies but that there was chance that their positions could be bettered as to power, frequency, and time, if they could prove that such changes would be in the public interest.⁵⁴ Mr. Jansky also urged the educational broadcasters not to overlook the possibilities of FM. This was also stressed by Mr. S. Howard Evans, Secretary of NCER.

Ensuing years saw more interest on the part of educational broadcasters in the possibilities of FM. There was some experimentation by commercial interests in the use of amplitude modulation in the ultra-high frequencies (above 25,000 kilocycles), and, by the end of 1939, experimentation with both AM and FM had expanded to a point where the FCC announced that it would inquire fully into the entire problem of FM and the ultra-high frequencies.⁵⁵ Throughout these developments, the NAEB leadership urged expanded educational use of FM.

During this same period many broadcasting bills were introduced in Congress. Some of these, such as a proposed tax on all stations based on wattage, were important to educational broadcasters, but the majority of them had to do with investigation of monopolistic practices and network policies. Actually, Congress did little about any of these problems. As stated in the New York Times for January 14, 1940:

"Broadcasters are anticipating a quiet session of Congress as far as radio legislation is concerned. Although there are about 50 bills pertaining to radio in the Senate and House, there appears little prospect, according to Washington observers; that more than a half-dozen may arise to plague the broadcasters. Reorganization of the Federal Communications Commission and resolutions demanding investigations of networks and 'radio monopolies' are definitely reported dead."⁵⁶

This period saw normal activity in the NAEB, with few startling developments. The exchange of information among members and committee activity continued to increase, with resultant strengthening of the organization. Correspondence and Newsletters of the late 1930's and early 1940's indicate increased activity on the part of the engineering committee. Tests were made on various types of recording equipment and the results made available to the membership. Technical articles about FM and its potential were prepared for the Newsletter. The members also were given advice about copyright problems in a series of articles prepared by Professor Frederick S. Siebert of the University of Illinois School of Journalism. At this time most of the recording companies and artists' unions were demanding payment of a fee when phonograph records were played by radio stations. Through efforts of the NAEB most of these fees were waived for educational stations or reduced to mere token payment. The Newsletter also carried information about Congressional and FCC actions and detailed information about the activities of various member stations, thus increasing the interchange of information. A number of stations exchanged scripts and transcriptions.

When the aforementioned FCC hearings on FM were held in March, 1940, there was no opposition to the continued reservation of 25 channels for educational broadcasting, and Mr. S. Howard Evans, Executive Secretary of the NCER, also representing the NAEB at the hearings, made the following two points:

"....because a number of (educational) stations might want to send facsimile messages as well as oral programs, it might be well to have a wide band frequency modulation so that the two things could be done by a duplexing process on a single frequency....(and) future developments in this (FM) field might make possible an educational broadcasting chain which would lessen the burden on individual stations so that they could concentrate on quality rather than quantity."⁵⁷

As a result of these hearings, the FCC reserved the frequency band from 42,000 to 50,000 kilocycles for FM broadcasting and specifically set aside five of the resulting 40 channels for educational, non-commercial stations.⁵⁸ (At the same time, changes were made in the channel allocations for television, but apparently the educational broadcasters were not concerned with trying to get television reservations at this time.)

The first station to operate in the ultra-high frequency band set aside for educational stations was WBOE, operated by the Cleveland Board of Education, which had gone on the air as an AM station in November, 1938. In February, 1941 WBOE changed to an FM operation.

By this time several other school systems and institutions of higher learning were making plans to operate FM stations, and many members of the NAEB were convinced that the future of educational broadcasting lay in FM.

Late in 1940 and early in 1941, the NAEB was active in attempting to secure an appointment to the FCC for Dr. Arthur G. Crane, chairman of the NCER, and president of the University of Wyoming. However, these efforts were in vain, and in March, 1941, a Ray C. Wakefield of Fresno, California, was appointed.⁵⁹

Even before the United States entered World War II, the NAEB was active in national defense activities. Suitable program ideas and scripts were exchanged and correspondence with national defense officials instituted to determine what educational broadcasters could do. At the 1942 convention, held September 5-6 at Purdue University, the following resolution was adopted:

"RESOLVED: That the Association pledges its fullest cooperation to the Radio Branch of the War Department and other governmental agencies assisting in the promotion of National Defense by the intelligent use of broadcasting facilities in the present emergency."⁶⁰

At this convention previous attempts at script exchange were formalized with the creation of an NAEB Script Exchange, headed by Nat. H. Erwin, WILL, University of Illinois, and definite rules were adopted for its operation.⁶¹

During the war years there was little change in the NAEB. This also was true generally for the entire broadcasting industry because of restrictions on the manufacture of equipment and other wartime limitations. However, cooperation among NAEB members continued to increase and the Association completed the evolution from a weak organization with a few zealous leaders, as it was in the middle 1930's, to a definite force for advancement in the field of educational broadcasting.

Although membership failed to increase appreciably during the war (there were only 23 member stations in 1944),⁶² the financial condition was good and in 1943 one-fourth of the Association's funds were invested in War Bonds.⁶³

Because of wartime restrictions on travel, some of the conventions during the war years were held in conjunction with the IER. At the 1943 convention, held May 1 in Columbus, it was reported that the Script Exchange had enjoyed rapid growth and utilization and that 140 scripts were available.⁶⁴

The war prevented new stations from going on the air because of the shortage of critical materials, but Association leaders urged plans for FM construction as soon as the war ended. These men realized that the FM allocation of frequencies for educational stations was an opportunity that could not be ignored as had the opportunity for AM utilization in the 1920's. The FCC was of like mind, as evidenced by the following excerpts from a speech made by FCC Chairman Fly before the Executive Committee of the FREC on September 16, 1943.⁶⁵

"....Following a prolonged struggle, which began long before the present Federal Communications Commission was set up, the present commission has found it possible to set aside five educational channels the country over exclusively for the use of non-commercial educational institutions. Those five channels afford room for hundreds of FM stations all over the country. It is not likely that every school board or other educational body which so desires can find room on one of those channels for a long time to come....Thus education now has what it has sought through bitter battle over more than a decade -- a home of its own on the air.

"But -- and this is the point I want chiefly to stress -- those choice channels were not set aside for absentees. The ether is far too crowded, the pressure from other interests seeking to use radio far too great, to permit continued reservation of those channels, unless educators actually get busy and fill them with educational stations....If education doesn't want and doesn't need these channels, and if it doesn't prove its desires and needs by actually making intensive use of them, history is going to repeat itself, and education will again find that it is left with memories of a lost opportunity.

"Some of you have memories long enough to recall what I mean. You will remember that in the early 1920's, when broadcasting was first capturing the attention of the American people and opening up vistas of unlimited service in the cause of human enlightenment, educational institutions....were among the first to pioneer in the new medium. A considerable portion of all the early radio broadcasting licenses issued were to educational institutions.

"One by one the majority of those early educational stations have fallen by the wayside. There have been exceptions....but certainly you will have to look a lot farther for a bona fide educational station....today than you would have 15 years ago.

"Some persons have blamed the old Federal Radio Commission....for that tendency of educational stations to fall by the wayside. Others have placed the blame on monopolistic politics within the broadcasting industry which have one by one either ousted or absorbed the pioneer educational stations. Here again I do not want to express an opinion, but I do want to suggest....that educators themselves were not altogether free of blame. As competition in the radio field became more and more intense, as equipment became better and therefore more expensive, as program quality rose and therefore required more effort, too many educational stations tended first to lag behind, and thereafter to abandon their licenses. After 1929, when educational budget problems became particularly acute, educational radio stations were among the first to feel the axe.

"....The Commission....has now done everything in its power to redress the balance of the old standard broadcast band....But there are some things we cannot do for you. We cannot build stations for you. We can't operate stations for you. And we can't supply programs for you. These are things education must supply for itself. And it must do so promptly if its channels are to be maintained. For....if education does not move into the home set aside for it, there were be plenty of others who will first seek and then demand admission to the vacant rooms.

"On the new FM band....your programs will be competing....with the best that commercial radio can offer. And remember, it's easy to play hookey from a radio school....In one sense, of course, all radio is educational, for better or worse. The local commercial stations and the networks alike are educating listeners every hour of the day and night....The techniques for reaching and impressing mass audiences so skillfully developed by commercial radio can and indeed must be applied....if the new educational FM stations are to live up to their promise....I want to suggest that the dramatic and narrative techniques which have proved successful in commercial competition are not without their lessons to the educator seeking to use a new and sensitive medium. Much progress has already been made in the direction of introducing 'listener interest' in educational programs. If the new FM stations are to succeed, that progress must continue.

"....after this war there will have to be a reshuffle of frequency assignments. Whole new portions of the spectrum....have been opened up through wartime research, while the expanding need for worldwide communications and especially the vast new aviation uses of radio, will in all probability crowd the postwar ether even more tightly than the comparatively smaller spectrum was jammed before the war. In such a reshuffle, the friends of educational radio will certainly want to hold their own. If their plans are ready, and they can show both the real use to which educational frequency assignments are being put and the proposed use for which plans have been fully laid, the necessary frequencies will no doubt remain available. But if lethargy prevails, and others seeking to expand their own services are able to show that the channels reserved for educational stations are going to waste, then it will almost certainly be difficult or impossible to continue the reservation of unused frequencies."

This same sentiment was to be echoed a decade later by FCC Chairman Paul Walker and other members of the FCC in regard to allocation of television channels for educational stations.

Possibly spurred by the comments of Chairman Fly, the NAEB, meeting in conjunction with the School Broadcast Conference in Chicago, November 29, 1943, passed the following resolution:⁶⁶

"Foreseeing the possible and probable use of FM by education immediately after the war and recognizing the necessity for having adequate facilities available, the National Association of Educational Broadcasters advocates:

"1. The reservation of ten channels in the spectrum for the use of education, and that these channels be adjacent to those reserved for commercial FM broadcasting.

"2. That more adequate provision be made for the use of FM relay stations by reservation of seven or more such frequencies for education.

"3. The reservation for the exclusive use of education, two channels in any assignment of such frequencies for television and that such channels shall be adjacent to any assigned for commercial television."

A copy of the resolution was forwarded to Commissioner John W. Studebaker of the U. S. Office of Education, urging the efforts of that office in behalf of adequate reservation of broadcasting facilities for education in the post-war era. Subsequently, Studebaker wrote to Fly asking that: 1) ten FM channels, in addition to the existing five, be reserved for educational use, 2) ten relay frequencies be reserved for use of educational stations, and 3) two television channels be reserved.⁶⁷ Studebaker also asked that the FCC allocate educational licenses according to state and regional plans which would insure that no section of a state would be denied educational radio service.

Studebaker reported on these developments at a meeting of the FREC in Washington, January 28, 1944. At this meeting it was reported that 15 state departments of education had asked the U. S. Office of Education to prepare tentative plans for post-war FM educational networks, and more than 50 state universities had named staff members to follow the developments in educational FM and recommend action by their respective institutions, and at least 25 boards of education, colleges and universities had submitted, or were preparing to submit, applications for FM licenses to the FCC.⁶⁸ Relative to the plans for state-wide FM networks, the NAEB Newsletter for August 1944 reported:

The FCC has received information from the U. S. Office of Education concerning proposed state-wide plans for the allocation of the five frequencies reserved for non-commercial educational FM broadcasting stations. It appears that such plans, if carefully prepared with a view of fair treatment of public and private educational institutions, both urban and rural, at the primary, secondary, higher, and adult education levels alike, may provide a sound means for securing the maximum possible utilization of educational frequencies. Accordingly, while the Commission must dispose of each application on its merits, it will give careful consideration in connection with educational applications to any state-wide plan filed with it."

On September 28, 1944, the FCC began hearings to obtain information for planning post-war frequency allocation policies. The Commission announced that a complete review of frequency allocations was necessary because of radio advances made during the war and the greatly increased demands for the use of radio.⁶⁹ The NAEB was represented at these hearings by Carl Menzer, State University of Iowa. Following are excerpts from the testimony presented by Menzer before the FCC in October, 1944:⁷⁰

"As long as there is AM broadcasting in the standard band, educational broadcasters must offer their services to the listeners. This is not an attempt to evaluate one system of broadcasting over another....Rather it is a statement of the fundamental premise that wherever there are radio broadcast listeners, there must be educational broadcasting in its proper proportion.

"The educational broadcasters offer cultural, informative and entertainment programs unique to large educational institutions and, in most instances, not available through any other source....There are vast areas within the United States where the listeners do not have access to any programs from any educational broadcasting stations. Furthermore, because of the crowded condition of the standard broadcast band, and because of the technical regulations necessary to prevent interference, all of the educational broadcasters represented

operate with restricted facilities that prevent them in large part from serving the area they would normally be expected to serve....Therefore, we as educational broadcasters respectfully submit to the Commission that the needs of educational broadcasters should be constantly kept in mind in any development or change which might result in the availability of additional AM facilities.

"It is apparent to the membership of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters that FM broadcasting offers limitless possibilities to improve and expand the educational broadcast service. Some of the members have pioneered in FM broadcasting while others are ready to start in this field as soon as the necessary equipment is available....

"Educational FM stations propose to offer direct to school broadcasting during school hours and adult extension classes during the evening hours as well as a balanced program of cultural and informative offerings for general consumption....This contemplated program will require both state-wide networks and individual stations operated by local educational institutions. Therefore, the NAEB endorses the recommendations of the U. S. Office of Education for a total of 15 channels for non-commercial educational broadcasting. In order to operate state-wide networks so that rural areas may be adequately served, the power restriction of 1,000 watts for educational stations should be removed....

"It has long been established that audio-visual aids are much more effective than either separately. Therefore, the place of educational broadcasting in facsimile and television is unquestioned. Practically the entire lecture-teaching process is embodied in such a system....Television broadcasting offers an intimate, flexible, and timely approach in educational programming....

"Several members of the NAEB have pioneered in television broadcasting and from their vast experience in this field they have learned the folly of trying to set up an expanded program of television service until definite standards have been set up. Educational institutions cannot stand the rapid obsolescence that hastily defined standards might lead to....

"In the allocation of facilities for television broadcasting and relay service, the NAEB recommends that provision be made for state-wide coverage for educational broadcasting. Our only recommendation on the technical standards to be established for television are that they be far-sighted enough to meet the needs of high quality transmission for some time to come and yet fall within the realm of practical application in the not too distant future."

At the 1944 convention, held in Chicago, October 22-23, the constitution was amended to make institutions holding construction permits for broadcasting stations eligible for membership with active status.⁷¹ The words "non-commercial" also appeared for the first time in this amendment. Previously the primary qualification was that the station be "educational," but it was felt that stations owned by educational institutions but operated on a commercial basis should not be eligible for membership even though a number of their programs might be educational in nature. An increase in dues to allow more money for NAEB activities was discussed at the Convention, but final constitutional amendment was not made until after a mail vote in June, 1945. This change provided for a graduated scale of dues for active members, depending on transmitter power, of \$10.00 to \$20.00.⁷²

The following year there were several FCC actions of importance to educational broadcasters. During the early part of the year the Commission held hearings to determine what, if any, reallocation of FM and television frequencies should be made. Without any particular activity on the part of the NAEB other than that previously mentioned for preceding years the FCC set aside 20 channels in the new FM band (which was moved from 25-30 megacycles to 88-106 megacycles) for the exclusive use of educational, non-commercial stations.⁷³

Also, in 1945, the FCC announced that it would hold hearings to determine if there should be a change in the method whereby clear channels were allocated. These hearings subsequently came to be known as the clear-channel hearings. The importance to the NAEB of this action is seen in the following excerpt from the March 1, 1945 Newsletter:

"The FCC report attached to the preliminary allocation proposal for educational stations indicated that educational stations might be able to offer coverage to the unserved areas which are largely of a sub-marginal character. This indicates....that applications by educational stations to break down clear channels might be favorably considered."

Subsequently NAEB President Frank Schooley appointed a special committee to study this entire problem and make recommendations for appropriate Association action.⁷⁴ This committee reported at the convention held in Chicago, September 17-18, and as a result the following resolution was adopted:⁷⁵

"The National Association of Educational Broadcasters, assembled at Chicago September 17-18, 1945, resolved to submit to the Federal Communications Commission its position with relation to the pending Clear Channel hearing.

"1. In its review of the evidence submitted at this hearing, the Commission is urged to consider the unique public services rendered by the educational and non-profit radio stations of the country.

"A study of the record of these stations must reveal the type of service which is not duplicated by any other group of stations in the United States. Their operation is truly in the public interest, convenience and necessity.

"2. The Association urges that the Commission seriously consider the contention that the principle of public service must prevail over the traditional yardstick of the protection of unreasonable coverage.

"3. The resources of America's leading educational institutions should be available to all. Yet the broadcast facilities of these stations are at this time so limited in terms of power, frequency, and hours of operation that only a portion of the available service is being broadcast.

"4. Our members are ready and, because of years of broadcast experience, are able to carry on an expanded radio service.

"The National Association of Educational Broadcasters respectfully urges that the rules regarding Clear Channel operation be revised. Revision should be such that full-time operation, sufficient power, and improved facilities be made possible in order to provide adequate service to listeners in those areas which the educational stations should rightfully serve."

In September, President Schooley appointed A. James Ebel, Chief Engineer for University of Illinois station WILL and Executive Secretary of the NAEB, as the NAEB representative to appear before the FCC at the Clear Channel hearings.⁷⁶

This increased activity of the NAEB was a hint of greater things to come in the future.

Chapter VII

THE POST-WAR YEARS

Plans for a permanent NAEB headquarters again were considered in 1945, and some of the leaders of the NAEB thought that money might be obtained from some foundation or other source for its establishment. Such a headquarters was felt to be especially important in view of the anticipated increase of educational stations resulting from the liberal allocation of FM frequencies for the exclusive use of educational stations. As of December 6, 1945, six FM educational stations had been licensed by the FCC, nine others had been granted construction permits, and there were 25 applications pending before the Commission.⁷⁷ (These figures are even more impressive when one realizes that at this time there were only 24 member stations in the NAEB.⁷⁸) These new stations would need guidance and the FCC wanted the NAEB to organize "in a very vigorous manner all the newcomers to the field."⁷⁹ A special committee of the NAEB was set up to investigate the possibilities of financial assistance for the establishment of a national headquarters.

During 1947 the NAEB officers stepped up their efforts to increase the number of educational stations and improve existing ones. By September, 1947 the number of educational institutions with construction permits for FM stations had increased to 36, and six more applications were pending before the FCC.⁸⁰ The NAEB active (station) membership had increased by approximately 50% over the preceding three years, and efforts to increase the membership still further were made.

The FCC hearings on the clear channel question continued through 1946 and 1947, and representatives of educational stations continued to testify in behalf of the position set forth in the NAEB resolution quoted earlier. Most of the testimony centered on the theme that, if educational stations were to provide the service their listeners deserved and wanted, the stations must be permitted to operate during the evening hours and must be allowed to increase their power.⁸¹ At the 1947 convention in Chicago, October 25-27, a formal resolution was passed empowering the NAEB's Clear Channel committee to proceed with plans to present testimony before the FCC.

"An official statement expressing the views of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters on clear channel broadcasting was approved. It pointed out that present AM clear channel allocations prevent full-time operation of nine educational stations in the U. S. and asked that these and other educational AM stations be allowed to operate from at least 6:00 a.m. until 10:00 p.m. daily to better serve listeners."⁸²

At this convention final approval was given to a plan whereby the NAEB would be organized into six regional districts, geographically, with the Executive Committee (board of directors) made up of one "governor" from each district. It was believed that such an organizational realignment would increase the strength of the Association and result in closer relations between stations in the various regions.

Relative to the oft-mentioned permanent headquarters, the following excerpt from the convention minutes is pertinent:⁸³

"Novik (Morris S. Novik, Executive Secretary) reported that he and Potter (Russell Potter, Columbia University) had talked with foundation representatives about the possibilities of obtaining funds for setting up a Washington office. Interest not high in such projects. Little help expected from those contacted. Other contacts suggested (Kellogg, Kresge, Racham). Possibility of adequate financing through member station contributions suggested...Moved, seconded and passed that the committee continue to investigate possibilities and report at the next regular meeting."

In January, 1948, the FCC held final hearings in the three-year-old clear channel controversy. Due to changes in FCC personnel, only two of the Commissioners were members of the Commission during the entire course of the clear channel proceedings. The NAEB leadership believed that this change in FCC personnel would lessen the likelihood of a decision favorable to educational broadcasters. Marcus Cohn (of the firm of Cohn and Marks, radio attorneys) presented the final memorandum brief and oral argument for the NAEB, urging that:

"....the quality of program service should be the determining factor (in deciding on channel usage) rather than the technical and arbitrary yardstick of protecting the coverage of clear channel stations to unreasonable limits. Upon this basis, there would be an improved broadcast service to rural (and local) audiences with programs designed for their special needs."⁸⁴

In March 1948, the Senate Interstate Commerce committee instructed the FCC to withhold its clear channel decision pending Congressional hearings on a bill introduced by Senator Edwin C. Johnson (Dem., Colo.) which called for clear channel breakdown and limitation of power to 50,000 watts.⁸⁵ The NAEB subsequently asked for permission to present testimony in the hearings before the Interstate Commerce committee, and in April Seymour N. Siegel (WNYC), H. H. Leake (Oklahoma A & M College) and Richard B. Hull (WOI), president of the NAEB, appeared before the committee on behalf of the Johnson bill.⁸⁶

During this period television was expanding rapidly, but very little interest in this new field was evinced by educational institutions. The following is quoted from the Newsletter of May 31, 1948:

"At the Ohio Radio Institute, many educational station operators were wondering 'out loud' if their failure to apply for and plan for TV facilities might not find them later in a difficult position. High cost and uncertainty of future developments were given as reasons for delay. To date only five institutions are regularly using or planning TV. The State University of Iowa has made application; Iowa State College has a CP; University of Michigan is producing programs which are fed to a Detroit station; Kansas State College is operating an experimental TV unit; and the American University (Washington, D. C.) is producing and feeding programs to a net TV outlet."

Although inactive in TV development, the educational broadcasters were becoming more active in other fields. In addition to their struggles for better facilities (the clear channel hearings), several institutions were attempting to arouse interest in state-wide FM networks, but only Wisconsin was making any real progress in this direction. Newsletters and correspondence from this period indicate that

more institutions and school systems were becoming interested in FM as an educational medium. Louisiana State University went on the air with an FM station in preference to an AM outlet because it was felt that the real future of radio lay in FM rather than AM broadcasting.⁸⁷ The Newsletter carried news of member station activities and suggestions for programs and general improvement. By April, 1948, the Association could boast 38 active members (institutions owning and operating their own stations) and 32 institutions, broadcasting over commercial outlets or planning radio activities, were associate members. In addition, there were six individual associate members, for a total NAEB membership of 76.⁸⁸

Late in June the FCC held hearings on assignment of television channels, and the NAEB was represented by Carl Menzer, WSUI. The Newsletter for July 31, 1948, stated that the hearings pointed up the following factors (only pertinent ones have been quoted):

- "1. Reallocations are definitely in the picture -- when and where remains a question....
- "2. There are more TV applications than frequencies in many areas, and the situation is likely to get worse rather than better.
- "3. Astonishingly few educators appear to be interested in television operation, considering the fact that once the TV channels are filled there is likely to be no second chance. Significant factor here is cost of installation and operation which is prohibitive for most, but may show short-sighted view of future."

Further hearings were held by the FCC in September, and in this connection Billboard for August 21, 1948, said:

"Last chance for educational institutions to get into television broadcasting is seen now resting with the Federal Communications Commission's September 20 hearing on upstairs video. All but crowded out of the television field, educational institutions are expected then to push vigorously for reservation of channels in the upper band. With present channels approaching the saturation point, it appears certain that saturation of spectrum space in the low band will find universities holding no more than six stations.

"Both FCC and the National Association of Educational Broadcasters are worried over failure of educational institutions to get aboard the TV bandwagon. NAEB has cited the high cost of initiating and operating a TV station as the chief reason for the lag of the educators in this important new field. Chairman Wayne Coy, of FCC, has issued two separate invitations for educators to appear at next month's hearings and request the Commission to set aside channels for educational outfits as has been done in FM."⁸⁹

The 1948 convention was held in Urbana, Illinois, October 10-12, and a resolution was adopted urging the FCC to reserve certain TV channels for educational and non-profit purposes. It was agreed that the educational stations must rid themselves of the last vestiges of complacency:

"Plans for the forthcoming year stressed basic job of setting up operation and program standards for member stations, 'a descent from the ivory tower' with stress on competition for audiences and public support. A plan for linking NAEB FM and AM stations first by transcription and later by relay network is now under study."⁹⁰

This convention marked the dawn of a new era for educational broadcasting and the NAEB as pointed out in the following article which appeared in Billboard, October 23, 1948:

"If the country's educational broadcasters are to win their right to service one-third of the population which, surveys have indicated, is so dissatisfied with commercial radio, they must win a major battle within the next year. This became apparent at the 22nd annual meeting of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters (NAEB) in Champaign, Ill., this week. Battle lines were clearly drawn at the meeting with opposition from commercial broadcasters expected on the one flank. On another is a fight within the NAEB, with one element, the progressive force now in power, favoring the establishment of a network, hiring of an Executive Secretary, doubling of dues and other aggressive action. Still another group is satisfied to remain status quo.

"First skirmish was won by the progressive element when Dick Hull, head of radio for Iowa State College and its station WOI at Ames, was re-elected president, with the board of directors and membership okaying his expansion plans. Hull's attitude can be summarized by two statements made at the meeting.

"The next year is the one in which we are going to have to discharge our obligation to bring one-third of the American radio audience the public service programming it cannot find on the air today,' he said. 'We're going to have to get together if we're going to be more than a curiosity on the scene.'

"Type of opposition that educational broadcasters can expect from outside their own ranks was indicated by reports that a former FCC Commissioner was interested in trying to have 20 FM channels presently assigned to educators taken away and given to potential commercial telecasters.

"Against this move and others of a similar type the NAEB expects to fight vigorously. Resolutions passed at the meeting called for the setting up of a Washington office to protect NAEB interests, the eventual hiring of a full-time executive secretary and arrangements for an intensive publicity and promotion campaign.

"Indicative also was the board's resolution stating that NAEB policy would be based on a decision to petition the FCC to reserve some television channels in the UHF band for eventual use by educational stations, even though the educational institutions might not be in a position to use these channels for years. Behind latter point was the reasoning that such channels are comparable to natural resources and should be reserved for use by institutions publicly owned or backed.

"Establishment of an educational FM network received consideration at the three day meeting October 10-12. After opposition from some members it was decided to go ahead with network planning and eventual operation. In outlining the feasibility of a network operation, Hull pointed out that NAEB now has 95 members and 50 stations in 31 states. He reviewed the fact that many of the stations cover large areas and that NAEB member stations, such as WNYC, New York, are talking of setting up regional public service networks. He further showed that if each of the stations could operate four hours a night and assign two hours of this as network option time, a top coverage job could be done by the net.

"As the beginning, plan is to have a transcription net with stations exchanging programs through a central office. Later, it is hoped, relays via wireless or cable would link stations and, it is planned, regional groupings. Already, it was said, the Canadian Broadcasting Company has offered to link with such a net.

"To set up such an operation, more money than the NAEB members can get immediately from their parent institutions will be required, it was admitted. For this reason, negotiations are under way with a top notch educational foundation which is being asked to put up \$50,000 to cover operations until the association can become self-supporting.

"As first step toward formation of an educational net, Dallas Smythe, former FCC economist, now stationed at the University of Illinois, is going to survey educational broadcasters and institutions to get material which would be used for initial planning of the web."91

Chapter VIII

DAWN OF A NEW ERA

Following the 1948 convention, steps were taken to implement the plans that had been formulated. An NAEB Television Study Committee, headed by H. B. McCarty, WHA, was appointed to study the feasibility of proposing to the FCC that a specified band of frequencies be set aside for the use of educational television.⁹² Because of the comparatively slow utilization of the FM frequencies set aside for educational use, the NAEB leadership feared that the FCC would not be enthusiastic about a similar allocation of television channels.

"Following a series of conferences....a joint statement warning college and university presidents, and boards of education to speed entry into educational broadcasting while frequencies are still available....was issued by Seymour Siegel,....M. S. Novik, NAEB executive secretary, and Richard Hull....NAEB President.

"The statement approved the rapidly growing number of educational institutions who have applied for 10 watt FM licenses, but pointed out the fact that applications are still lagging....and stressed the fact that the FCC will not reserve these frequencies indefinitely."⁹³

Subsequently at an NAEB meeting held in conjunction with the IER at Columbus, May 8, 1949, the membership adopted a resolution urging the FCC to continue the reservation of FM frequencies for educational uses.⁹⁴

"The NAEB board of directors pointed out at the Columbus meeting that several plans for television reallocation suggested earlier this year would have imperiled or completely destroyed the educational FM band, and recent application by church groups in the Northwest, the South, and on the East Coast would have further imperiled the educational status of the FM band. Low powered FM, the directors felt, is just getting underway, and it as well as higher-power educational FM should be protected."

During this same period the NAEB made overtures to several foundations for funds to carry out the plans formulated at the 1948 convention. Early in 1949 funds were obtained from the Rockefeller Foundation for an "International Seminar on Educational Radio" (The First Allerton Conference). Co-sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation and the University of Illinois Institute of Communications Research, the conference was held June 29 - July 12, 1949, at Allerton Park, University of Illinois. The general theme of the conference was "Where does educational broadcasting go from here?" and the general areas covered included public service and educational radio, mass-education goals of radio, and non-commercial broadcasting. More than 30 leading educational radio men from the United States, Canada and Great Britain took part in the two-week conference.⁹⁵

On July 11, 1949, the FCC released its proposed allocation plan for television channels. The plan provided for a total of 2,245 possible stations in 1,400 communities on 12 VHF and 42 UHF channels, but failed to make any reservation of channels for educational stations. The NAEB immediately filed its intention of appearing at the hearings on the proposed allocation plan, and was joined in this intention by the National University Extension Association, the U. S. Office of Education, and other similar agencies. It was expected that the Land Grant College Association and many individual educational institutions would also testify.⁹⁶ In its petition, filed with the FCC in August, the NAEB requested that 10 channels in the UHF band be set aside for non-commercial, educational stations.⁹⁷

Plans for the NAEB presentation before the FCC were discussed at the 1949 convention, October 15-17, at Ann Arbor, Michigan. Also, plans were still underway for a relay network:

"NAEB plans for establishing regional FM repeater networks were given further impetus....with the report by Carl Wesser, consulting engineer from Detroit, who demonstrated a plan whereby presently operating educational stations could be linked....throughout the Midwest. Such a network would include college, university, and board of education stations in the following cities: Toledo, Cleveland, Detroit, Ann Arbor, East Lansing, Madison, Chicago, Urbana, LaFayette, Bloomington, Minneapolis, Northfield (Minnesota), Ames, and Iowa City."⁹⁸

In the fall of 1949 NAEB President Hull submitted requests for funds to several foundations. A request for approximately \$4,000,000 to cover a ten year period was made to the Ford Foundation to enable the NAEB to establish a national headquarters and a program production center.⁹⁹ Identical requests for \$12,000 were made to the Lincoln Foundation and the Eli Lilly Foundation "for a one-year period of interim and emergency financing to permit the group (NAEB)....to establish a permanent national office and to consolidate the gains made thus far, and which currently are in jeopardy."¹⁰⁰ None of these requests resulted in grants to the NAEB.

1949 also saw the beginnings of the program exchange that was later to be dubbed "the bicycle network." Station WNYC, New York City, made five sets of recordings of the 1949 Herald Tribune Forum which were distributed to and aired by 22 NAEB member stations. By 1950 the "bicycle network" had advanced to the point where several stations agreed to exchange programs by tape recording. Seymour Siegel, Director of WNYC, recorded several programs from the New York area for distribution, and the Association received a gift of tape from the Cooper Union for use in the project.¹⁰¹ By May, Siegel was able to report that the "network which is enjoying enormous growth, will soon be able to furnish four hours of programs per day to member stations, and will include selected programs from BBC and CBS as well as excellent offerings from member stations and institutions."¹⁰² This "bicycle" operation, though considered to be a function of the NAEB, was actually carried out by Siegel and his WNYC staff with little outside assistance or financial aid.

The Second Allerton Seminar was held at the University of Illinois July 2-18, 1950. Like the 1949 seminar it was co-sponsored by the University of Illinois Division of Communications and the Rockefeller Foundation's Division of Humanities. Whereas the first conference had dealt with the question "What is the job of educational broadcasters?" the second conference considered the question "How to do the job," and the participants in the seminar were men and women actually engaged in planning and producing educational programs over NAEB stations.¹⁰³

Although the number of educational FM stations had increased, many educational institutions hesitated to build FM stations because of competition from television and the decline in manufacture of FM receivers. In an effort to alleviate the latter situation, NAEB President Hull wrote, June 19, 1950, to Senator Edwin C. Johnson, chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce committee urging that FM tuners be included in all TV sets manufactured.¹⁰⁴

In 1950 the NAEB constitution was revised to: 1) bring it up to date in terms of FM and TV operations, 2) furnish an adequate dues structure, and 3) permit incorporation so that foundation grants could be accepted.¹⁰⁵

At the 1950 NAEB convention, held in Lexington, Kentucky, October 29-31, several encouraging reports were presented. The tape network, begun a year earlier as an experiment had "grown in service and stature until it (was) no longer an experiment, but a large scale activity which (had) outgrown its facilities and financial structure." The network served 34 member stations. Dean Wilbur Schramm of the University of Illinois formally proposed a plan whereby the NAEB network could locate at the University of Illinois and could be financed and supported by a series of special grants in addition to the specific contributions of housing and personnel that the University of Illinois would be willing to make. The proposal was accepted for record and a more detailed memorandum describing the finer points of the operation requested for study by the new NAEB board of directors.¹⁰⁶ At the convention it was reported that the NAEB numbered 105 member institutions, 67 of which operated stations.

In the fall of 1950, the NAEB was instrumental in the formation of the Joint Committee on Educational Television (JCET). The JCET was established to coordinate the efforts of all organizations interested in the reservation of channels for educational television, and in later years served as an advisory board to all institutions planning educational television stations.¹⁰⁷ The hearings on reservation of channels for educational television began November 27, 1950, with additional hearings held on January 15, 1951.

During 1951 the NAEB increased its efforts to formalize the JCET and through the services of the firm of Oram and Rich, Consultants in Fund Raising and Public Relations, \$32,528.59 was raised to help finance JCET activities in behalf of educational television.¹⁰⁸ On April 23, 1951, the JCET was formally constituted and a grant of \$90,000 was made by the Fund for Adult Education to enable the JCET to carry on its activities.¹⁰⁹

1951 also saw fruition of the proposal outlined by Dean Schramm at the 1950 convention. Largely through his efforts, the NAEB received, on May 23, 1951, a grant of \$245,350 from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, for a five year period, for the establishment of a permanent NAEB headquarters and an NAEB tape network. The grant provided that the expense of network operation gradually be assumed by the NAEB during the five year period so that it would become self-supporting by the end of the term of the grant.¹¹⁰ Under the terms of the grant the headquarters and network would be located at the University of Illinois. The grant also provided funds to allow the NAEB to hold annual seminars for the further training of educational broadcasting personnel and funds to provide for research in the area of educational broadcasting. On August 24, 1951, James Miles, Director of WBAA, Purdue University, was named by the NAEB board of directors as Director of the Kellogg Radio Project.¹¹¹ (This is the official title of the NAEB Executive Director in terms of the agreement between the W. K. Kellogg Foundation and the University of

Illinois, administrator of the grant.) Richard Rider, of the University of Illinois, earlier named to manage the tape network during the interim period before the network and headquarters operations were formalized, was appointed Network Manager and Assistant Director of the Kellogg Radio Project.¹¹²

1951 was highlighted by other developments favorable to the NAEB. On March 22, the FCC issued its proposed allocation of television channels which included a reservation of 209 channels for the use of educational, non-commercial stations.¹¹³ On May 3, in a speech before the IER at Columbus, Ohio, NAEB President Siegel announced that the NAEB had received a grant from the Fund for Adult Education of \$300,000 for the development of outstanding educational radio programs to be released over the NAEB tape network.¹¹⁴ At the NAEB board meeting held in connection with the IER it was announced that the Fund for Adult Education had also granted the NAEB \$25,000 for a series of TV monitoring studies.¹¹⁵

During the next two years additional grants were received by the NAEB to further its work in educational broadcasting. In 1952:¹¹⁶

1) Grant of \$80,000 from the Fund for Adult Education (FAE) for grants-in-aid to educational radio and television stations for production of outstanding broadcast series.

2) Grant of \$12,500 and another of \$3,000 from the FAE for further TV monitoring studies.

In 1953 the following major grants were received by the NAEB:¹¹⁷

1) \$10,000 from the FAE for a seminar on educational television (The Lincoln Lodge Seminar).

2) \$12,000 from the FAE for a television production workshop for persons engaged in educational television activities, held in August-September at the University of Illinois.

3) \$5,000 from the FAE for a television management seminar, held at Iowa State College, August 30 - September 5.

4) \$12,500 from the FAE for further TV monitoring studies.

5) \$5,000 from an anonymous donor for the "Chicago Radio Project," an experimental literature series.

6) \$80,000 from the FAE for another series of grants-in-aid.

7) \$30,000 from the FAE for the Pacifica Foundation. (Grant to be administered by the NAEB)

8) \$1,000 from the Edward L. Vernays Foundation for the New York Educational Institute of the Air.

During this two year period NAEB services to member stations increased with a resulting rise in membership. On January 1, 1954, the NAEB membership totaled 218. Of this number 107 were institutions operating their own stations (104 radio and three television), 89 were institutions producing programs over commercial outlets, and 22 were organizations and individuals interested in the furtherance of

the activities and aims of the NAEB. 78 member stations participated in the NAEB tape network whose efficiency had been increased by the purchase, in 1952, of a multiple channel duplicator. This duplicator, purchased for \$10,000 from special funds provided by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, permitted mass duplication of eleven taped programs simultaneously, at high speed. The NAEB headquarters had grown until the staff numbered seven full-time and three half-time employees.¹¹⁸

As the new year, 1954, began, plans were underway for further enlargement of the services of the NAEB headquarters and network. The FAE had provided funds: 1) to establish an NAEB Television Engineering Service, with a full-time television engineer to offer aid and advice to educational groups planning TV stations; 2) to establish an Educational Television and Radio Placement Service; and 3) for part-time services of a consultant in management problems. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation made additional grants for a new mass duplicator and for a full time Associate Director, to assist the Executive Director.

The NAEB, after nearly 30 years, had finally achieved a position of real leadership in the field of educational broadcasting, due primarily to the foresight and efforts of that small group of educational broadcasters who had guided the destinies of the NAEB through the many lean years, never losing sight of their goals and never relaxing in their struggle against seemingly insurmountable odds.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The great bulk of the reference material used consisted of correspondence of NAEB officers and members through the years, official records of the Association, news bulletins, Newsletters, and information obtained through conversations and correspondence with NAEB leaders, past and present. Only two publications were used.

Frost, S. E., Jr. Education's Own Stations (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937)

Tyson, Levering, ed. Radio and Education: Proceedings of the Second Annual Assembly of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932)

Appendix A

NOTES

1. S. E. Frost, Jr., Education's Own Stations (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937), P. 3 ff.
2. Copy of resolution included in report of conference by W. I. Griffith.
3. Letter, B. B. Brackett to T. M. Beaird, June 24, 1931.
4. From original constitution of ACUBS.
5. Minutes of 1930 convention.
6. Ibid.
7. "Bulletin," December, 1930.
8. Mimeographed letter, R. C. Higgy to all members, November 17, 1930.
9. Undated mimeographed bulletin from U. S. Office of Education.
10. "Bulletin," February 20, 1931.
11. Frost, op.cit., p. 12.
12. Ibid., pp. 49-50.
13. Ibid., p. 88.
14. Ibid., pp. 49-50.
15. Letter, J. F. Wright to Sen. Otis F. Glenn, February, 1932.
16. "Bulletin," February 18, 1932.
17. Ibid.
18. Letter, T. M. Beaird to B. B. Brackett, December 8, 1932.
19. "Bulletin," March 16, 1932.
20. "Bulletin," February 24, 1932.
21. Letter, Armstrong Perry to B. B. Brackett, April 7, 1932.
22. Levering Tyson, ed., Radio and Education: Proceedings of the Second Annual Assembly of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932), p. 213 ff.
23. "Bulletin," February, 1933.

24. Letter, J. F. Wright to ACUBS officers, March 25, 1933.
25. "Bulletin," December 12, 1932.
26. Letter, B. B. Brackett to Armstrong Perry, January 13, 1933.
27. Undated letter, B. B. Brackett to W. D. Palmer.
28. Mimeographed letter, J. F. Wright to all members, August 3, 1934.
29. Letter, J. F. Wright to all members, August 15, 1934.
30. Mimeographed letter, J. W. Stafford to KUSD, February 26, 1934.
31. Letter, J. F. Wright to FRC Commissioner J. H. Hanley, February 13, 1934.
32. From copy of editorial distributed with letter from T. M. Beaird to ACUBS officers, September 15, 1934.
33. Memorandum, T. M. Beaird to all members, July 20, 1934.
34. "Bulletin," February 18, 1935.
35. Letter, Carl Menzer to all members, March 23, 1935.
36. Minutes of 1935 convention.
37. Ibid.
38. From copy of talk given by Dr. Crane.
39. Letter, W. I. Griffith to all members, June 14, 1935.
40. Letter, W. I. Griffith to all members, May 26, 1935.
41. Newsletter, February 17, 1936.
42. Ibid.
43. Mimeographed letter and questionnaire from NAEB headquarters to all educational stations, August 28, 1936.
44. Letter, H. B. McCarty to W. I. Griffith and J. C. Jensen, April 10, 1936.
45. Letter, H. B. McCarty to B. B. Brackett, July 3, 1936.
46. Newsletter, October 20, 1936.
47. Newsletter, March 20, 1937.
48. Newsletter, July 7, 1937.
49. Summary of 1937 convention, mailed with Newsletter, September 22, 1937.
50. Newsletter, February 15, 1938.

51. Newsletter, April 1, 1938.
52. Newsletter, May 15, 1938.
53. Newsletter, September 15, 1938.
54. Ibid.
55. Newsletter, January 1, 1940.
56. Newsletter, February 1, 1940.
57. Newsletter, April 1, 1940.
58. Newsletter, June 1, 1940.
59. Newsletter, March 15, 1941.
60. Copy of resolution adopted by 1942 convention.
61. Newsletter, September 15, 1942.
62. Statement of Carl Menzer made before the FCC, October, 1944, re "Allocation of frequencies to the various classes of non-governmental services in the radio spectrum from 10 kilocycles to 30,000,000 kilocycles."
63. Newsletter, May 1, 1943.
64. Ibid.
65. Newsletter, October 1, 1943.
66. Newsletter, December 1, 1943.
67. Newsletter, March 1, 1944.
68. Ibid.
69. Newsletter, September 1, 1944.
70. Menzer, op. cit.
71. Newsletter, November 1, 1944.
72. Newsletter, July 1, 1945.
73. Ibid.
74. Newsletter, May 1, 1945.
75. Copy of Clear Channel Resolution adopted by convention, September 17-18, 1945.
76. Letter, J. A. Ebel to Carl Menzer, September 20, 1945.
77. Newsletter, January, 1946.

78. From testimony of J. A. Ebel before FCC Clear Channel Hearings, January 14-17, 1946
79. Letter, F. E. Schooley to H. B. McCarty and Carl Menzer, July 1, 1945.
80. Newsletter, October 3, 1947.
81. Newsletter, May 1, 1946.
82. Newsletter, November 15, 1947.
83. Minutes of 1947 convention, October 25-27, 1947.
84. Newsletter, February 1, 1948.
85. Newsletter, March 20, 1948.
86. Newsletter, April 20, 1948.
87. Ibid.
88. Ibid.
89. Newsletter, August 31, 1948.
90. Newsletter, November 1, 1948.
91. Copy of article from Billboard, October 23, 1948, "NAEB Puts up its Dukes."
92. Newsletter, January, 10, 1949.
93. Newsletter, March 1, 1949.
94. Newsletter, May 15, 1949.
95. Newsletter, June 13, 1949.
96. Newsletter, July 20, 1949.
97. Newsletter, August 22, 1949.
98. Newsletter, October 30, 1949.
99. Letter, R. B. Hull to Peter Odegard, chairman, Ford Foundation, August 30, 1949.
100. Letters, R. B. Hull to E. I. Lilly Foundation and Lincoln Foundation, October 10, 1949.
101. Newsletter, March, 1950.
102. Newsletter, May, 1950.
103. From file of material dealing with Second Allerton Seminar.

104. Letter, R. B. Hull to Sen. Edwin C. Johnson, June 19, 1950.
105. Newsletter, May, 1950.
106. Newsletter, November-December, 1950.
107. Ibid.
108. Letter, Eva Bates, Oram & Rich, to Seymour Siegel, June 18, 1951.
109. Letter, R. B. Hull to NAEB membership, April 27, 1951.
110. Memorandum, Wilbur Schramm to NAEB board of directors, June 8, 1951.
111. Letter, Seymour Siegel to James Miles, August 24, 1951.
112. Minutes, meeting of the NAEB board of directors, June 8-9, 1951.
113. Newsletter, April, 1951.
114. Newsletter, May-June, 1951.
115. Ibid.
116. Data from Frank E. Schooley, Treasurer, NAEB.
117. Ibid.
118. Data from NAEB Headquarters.

Appendix B

This appendix indicates subsequent status of the 41 educational stations that were dues-paying members of the NAEB in 1926.

Following are still members of NAEB:

WHAZ, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York
 KUSD, University of South Dakota, Vermillion
 KFJM, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks
 KOAC, Oregon State College, Corvallis
 WHA, University of Wisconsin, Madison
 WNAD, University of Oklahoma, Norman
 WSUI, State University of Iowa, Iowa City
 KWSC, Washington State College, Pullman
 WOI, Iowa State College, Ames
 KFKU, University of Kansas, Lawrence
 WOSU (formerly WEAO), The Ohio State University, Columbus

Following are now operated commercially, but there is no record of when or why they ceased educational broadcasting:

WCAP, Asbury Park, New Jersey
 WMAZ, Macon, Georgia

The following ceased educational broadcasting as indicated:

WAPI, Alabama Polytechnic Institute - leased to commercial interests, August 1, 1932.
 WTAW, Texas A & M - began commercial operation during depression, exact date unknown.
 WHAD, Marquette University - sold to commercial interests, May 29, 1934.
 KOB, New Mexico State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts - began partial commercial operation in November 1930; leased to commercial interests, September 12, 1931; sold to commercial interests, May 7, 1936.
 WEW, St. Louis University - began commercial operation since war.
 KUOA, University of Arkansas - leased to commercial interests, May 20, 1932; sold April 28, 1933.
 WEBW, Beloit College - sold to commercial interests, April 16, 1930.
 KUOM, University of Montana - license allowed to expire, October 31, 1929.
 WCAJ, Nebraska Wesleyan University - Sold to commercial interests, July 5, 1933.
 KFHA, Western State College of Colorado - sold to commercial interests, August 26, 1930.
 KFKA, Colorado State College of Education - sold to commercial interests, April 11, 1930.
 WCAT, South Dakota School of Mines - ceased operation, date unknown.
 WEMC, Emmanuel Missionary College - sold to commercial interests, August 29, 1930.
 KFRU, Stephens College - sold to commercial interests, 1932.
 WCSO, Wittenberg College - sold to commercial interests, September 26, 1930.
 WDBC, Rollins College - sold to commercial interests, December 19, 1929.
 (Now has FM station, WPRK, and is member of NAEB)
 KFMX, Carleton College - license allowed to expire, April 1, 1933.
 KFDY, South Dakota State College of A & M Arts - ceased operation, date unknown.
 WGST, Georgia School of Technology - has operated commercially since 1930.

There is no record available indicating what happened to the following stations that were among the 41 1926 NAEB members. The NAEB records do not indicate what institutions these call letters represented, and no stations with such call letters are operating today, either educationally or commercially.

WABQ, KFMR, KWUC, WCUW, WCBH, WGBX, WPAK, KFUT, WBAO.

Appendix C

OFFICERS OF THE NAEB

The following is a list of officers and board members of the NAEB. This information has been obtained from letters and official records but is incomplete for some years because records of some years, especially early in the history of the Association, do not contain this information. During the years the governing board has been known variously as the Executive Committee-at Large, the Executive Committee, and the Board of Directors. Also, in some years these men have been selected from the country as a whole, while in others they have been selected from geographic regions. In certain instances the immediate past-president has been a member of the board, as at present, but this has not been consistently true. For those years for which records are incomplete only those offices are listed which can be determined.

1925:

Secretary-Treasurer - J. C. Jensen, WCAJ

1926:

President - Charles A. Culver, KFMX

Vice President - Earle M. Terry, WHA

Secretary-Treasurer - J. C. Jensen, WCAJ

Board of Directors:

Harold K. Bergman, WCAD

Robert Higgy, WOSU

Charles C. Shumard, WGST

D. C. Faber, WOI

R. W. Goddard, KOB

1927: Secretary-Treasurer - J. C. Jensen, WCAJ

1928:

Vice-President - J. C. Jensen, WCAJ

Treasurer - R. W. Goddard, KOB

1929:

President - J. C. Jensen, WCAJ

Vice-President - E. M. Terry, WHA

Treasurer - R. W. Goddard, KOB

Acting Treasurer - Evan Carroon, KOB (assumed office on death of Goddard)

Board of Directors:

W. J. Williams, WHAZ

R. C. Higgy, WOSU

T. M. Beaird, WNAD

D. C. Faber, WOI

Paul V. Maris, KOAC

1930:

President - R. C. Higgy, WOSU

Vice-President - H. V. Carpenter, KWSC

Secretary-Treasurer - B. B. Brackett, KUSD

Executive Secretary - R. C. Higgy (assumed these duties in addition to Presidency)

Board of Directors:

W. J. Williams, WHAZ

J. B. Hasselman, WKAR

B. C. Riley, WRUF

J. C. Jensen, WCAJ

P. V. Maris, KOAC

1931:

President - R. C. Higgy, WOSU

Vice-President - Carl Menzer, WSUI

Secretary-Treasurer - B. B. Brackett, KUSD

Executive Secretary - T. M. Beaird, WNAD

Board of Directors:

Daniel E. Noble, WCAC

J. B. Hasselman, WKAR

Garland Powell, WRUF

W. I. Griffith, WOI

H. V. Carpenter, KWSC

Charles A. Culver, KFMX

1932:

President - Josef F. Wright, WILL

Vice-President - W. I. Griffith, WOI

Secretary-Treasurer - B. B. Brackett, KUSD

Executive Secretary - T. M. Beaird, WNAD

Board of Directors:

Daniel Noble, WCAC

G. R. Faint, WJBU

Garland Powell, WRUF

H. B. Ingham, KFKU

H. V. Carpenter, KWSC

R. C. Higgy, WOSU

1933:

President - Josef F. Wright, WILL

Vice-President - W. I. Griffith, WOI

Secretary-Treasurer - B. B. Brackett, KUSD

Executive Secretary - T. M. Beaird, WNAD

1934:

President - W. I. Griffith, WOI

Vice-President - H. B. Ingham, KFKU

Secretary-Treasurer - B. B. Brackett, KUSD

Executive Secretary - T. M. Beaird, WNAD

Board of Directors:

J. F. Wright, WILL
 C. A. Taylor, WESG
 R. C. Higgy, WOSU
 E. P. Humbert, WTAU
 H. B. McCarty, WHA
 F. F. Nalder, KWSC

1935:

President - H. B. McCarty, WHA
 Vice-President - W. I. Griffith, WOI
 Secretary-Treasurer - B. B. Brackett, KUSD
 Executive Secretary - Harold Engel, WHA
 Board of Directors:

C. A. Taylor, WESG
 R. C. Higgy, WOSU
 E. P. Humbert, WTAU
 M. C. Jensen, WCAL
 F. F. Nalder, KWSC
 Carl Menzer, WSUI

1936:

President - H. B. McCarty, WHA
 Vice-President - Carl Menzer, WSUI
 Secretary-Treasurer - B. B. Brackett, KUSD
 Executive Secretary - Harold Engel, WHA
 Board of Directors:

C. E. Dammon, WBAA
 R. C. Higgy, WOSU
 E. P. Humbert, WTAU
 F. F. Nalder, KWSC
 W. E. Phillips, WILL
 C. A. Taylor, WESG

1937:

President - Carl Menzer, WSUI
 Vice-President - Harold Engel, WHA
 Secretary-Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
 Executive Secretary - F. E. Schooley, WILL
 Board of Directors:

Garland Powell, WRUF
 Homer Heck, WNAD
 H. G. Ingham, KFKU
 L. L. Roberts, KOAC
 C. A. Taylor, WESG
 H. B. McCarty, WHA

1938:

President - Carl Menzer, WSUI
 Vice-President - Harold Engel, WHA
 Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
 Executive Secretary - F. E. Schooley, WILL

Board of Directors:

Garland Powell, WRUF
Homer Heck, WNAD
H. G. Ingham, KFKU
L. L. Roberts, KOAC
C. A. Taylor, WESG
H. B. McCarty, WHA

1939:

President - H. G. Ingham, KFKU
Vice-President - M. R. White, KWSC
Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
Executive Secretary - F. E. Schooley, WILL

Board of Directors:

Carl Menzer, WSUI
M. S. Novik, WNYC
Harold Engel, WHA
Homer Heck, WNAD
M. C. Jensen, WCAL
Luke L. Roberts, KOAC

1940:

President - H. G. Ingham, KFKU
Vice-President - M. C. Jensen, WCAL
Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
Executive Secretary - F. E. Schooley, WILL

Board of Directors:

Carl Menzer, WSUI
M. S. Novik, WNYC
Harold Engel, WHA
Homer Heck, WNAD
L. L. Roberts, KOAC
Garland Powell, WRUF

1941:

President - Harold Engel, WHA
Vice-President - Gilbert D. Williams, WBAA
Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
Executive Secretary - F. E. Schooley, WILL

Board of Directors:

H. H. Leake, WNAD
Carl Menzer, WSUI
Allen Miller, KWSC
M. S. Novik, WNYC
E. J. O'Brien, KFJM

1942:

President - Harold Engel, WHA
Vice-President - Gilbert D. Williams, WBAA
Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
Executive Secretary - F. E. Schooley, WILL

Board of Directors:

Homer Heck, WNAD
Carl Menzer, WSUI
Allen Miller, KWSC
M. S. Novik, WNYC
E. J. O'Brien, KFJM

1943:

President - Gilbert D. Williams, WBAA
Vice-President - Allen Miller, KWSC
Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
Executive Secretary - F. E. Schooley, WILL
Board of Directors:

George Jennings, Chicago Radio Council
M. C. Jensen, WCAL
Robert Coleman, WKAR
M. S. Novik, WNYC
C. Wilbert Pettigrew, WOSU

1944:

President - F. E. Schooley, WILL
Vice-President - Allen Miller, KWSC
Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
Executive Secretary - James Ebel, WILL
Board of Directors:

Carl Menzer, WSUI
E. W. Ziebarth, WLB
Robert Coleman, WKAR
M. S. Novik, WNYC
John Dunn, WNAD
James Miles, WBAA

1945:

President - F. E. Schooley, WILL
Vice-President - Allen Miller, KWSC
Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
Executive Secretary - James Ebel, WILL
Board of Directors:

Robert Coleman, WKAR
John Dunn, WNAD
Richard Hull, WOI
Carl Menzer, WSUI
James Miles, WBAA
M. S. Novik, WNYC

1946:

President - Harold Engel, WHA
Vice-President - Robert Coleman, WKAR
Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
Executive Secretary - M. S. Novik

Board of Directors:

Waldo Abbot, WUOM
John Dunn, WNAD
Richard Hull, WOI
M. C. Jensen, WCAL
James Miles, WBAA
Russell Potter, Columbia University

1947:

President - Richard Hull, WOI
Vice-President - John Dunn, WNAD
Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
Executive Secretary - M. S. Novik
Board of Directors:

Seymour N. Siegel, WNYC
Graydon Ausmus, WUOA
F. E. Schooley, WILL
Carl Menzer, WSUI
Ralph Steetle, WLSU
William Sener, University of Southern California

1948:

President - Richard Hull, WOI
Vice-President - John Dunn, WNAD
Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
Executive Secretary - M. S. Novik
Board of Directors:

Seymour Siegel, WNYC
Graydon Ausmus, WUOA
Ralph Steetle, WLSU
Harry J. Skornia, WFIU
Irving Merrill, KUSD
James Morris, KOAC

1949:

President - Richard Hull, WOI
Vice-President - Harry J. Skornia, WFIU
Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
Secretary - Burton Paulu, KUOM
Executive Secretary - M. S. Novik
Board of Directors:

Seymour Siegel, WNYC
Graydon Ausmus, WUOA
James Miles, WBAA
Irving Merrill, KUSD
John Dunn, WNAD
James Morris, KOAC

1950:

President - Seymour Siegel, WNYC
 Vice-President - Graydon Ausmus, WUOA
 Treasurer - W. I. Griffith, WOI
 Secretary - Burton Paulu, KUOM
 Executive Secretary - M. S. Novik
 Board of Directors:
 Sam Gould, Boston University
 Alvin Gaines, Board of Education, Atlanta
 James Miles, WBAA
 Richard Hull, WOI
 Ralph Steetle, WLSU
 Allen Miller, KWSC

1951:

President - Seymour Siegel, WNYC
 Vice-President - Graydon Ausmus, WUOA
 Treasurer - F. E. Schooley, WILL
 Secretary - Burton Paulu, KUOM
 Executive Director - James Miles
 Board of Directors:
 Parker Wheatley, WGBH
 Alvin Gaines, Board of Education, Atlanta
 Waldo Abbot, WUOM
 Richard Hull, WOI
 John Dunn, WNAD
 Allen Miller, KWSC

1952:

President - Graydon Ausmus, WUOA
 Vice-President - Burton Paulu, KUOM
 Treasurer - F. E. Schooley, WILL
 Secretary - James Miles, WBAA
 Executive Director - James Miles, Frank E. Schooley and Harry J. Skornia
 Board of Directors:
 Parker Wheatley, WGBH
 Earl Wynn, WUNC
 Waldo Abbot, WUOM
 Richard Hull, WOI
 John Dunn, WNAD
 Allen Miller, KWSC
 Seymour Siegel, WNYC

1953:

President - Graydon Ausmus, WUOA
 Vice-President - John Dunn, WNAD
 Treasurer - F. E. Schooley, WILL
 Secretary - Armand Hunter, WKAR-TV
 Executive Director - Harry J. Skornia

Board of Directors:

James MacAndrew, WNYE

Earl Wynn, WUNC

Paul Rickard, Wayne University

Richard Hull, WOI

Marguerite Fleming, KSLH

Allen Miller, KWSC

Seymour Siegel, WNYC

Scanned from the National Association of Educational Broadcasters Records
at the Wisconsin Historical Society as part of
"Unlocking the Airwaves: Revitalizing an Early Public and Educational Radio Collection."



A collaboration among the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities,
University of Wisconsin-Madison Department of Communication Arts,
and Wisconsin Historical Society.

Supported by a Humanities Collections and Reference Resources grant from
the National Endowment for the Humanities



WISCONSIN
HISTORICAL
SOCIETY



WISCONSIN
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON



Any views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this publication/collection do not necessarily reflect those of the
National Endowment for the Humanities.